THE LOCUS OF POLICY, ALLOCATIVE, AND COORDINATION DECISIONS IN SELECTED MULTI-CAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

BY

DONNA ELIZABETH MILLER

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1986

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As the light at the end of the tunnel grows brighter and the achievement of the goal a reality, I wish to acknowledge the individuals who provided the support and inspiration to make it possible. Deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks go to Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, my committee chairman, for his belief in me, his encouragement when I faltered, and his support in all areas of my doctoral program and professional career. Special thanks go to Dr. James Hale for patient guidance in the conceptualizing of the study and to Dr. Margaret Morgan who also served as a committee member in the early stages of the study. Special acknowledgment is due to Dr. Jimmy Cheek and Dr. James Hensel who graciously agreed to serve as committee members after Dr. Hale's resignation and Dr. Morgan's retirement.

To the numerous special friends who provided motivation, support, encouragement, and prayers, I extend my heartfelt thanks. Very special thanks go to Dr. Theresa Vernetson who quieted many fears and was a special kind of friend through the early trials and fears; to Pam Zimpfer, one of those rare individuals who instinctively knows precisely when to provide the loving care or the swift kick; and to Brenda Hattaway and Ann Register who came into my life late in the

process but gave in countless ways to provide statistical assistance and to keep my ego intact.

I wish also to express my sincere appreciation to all those folks at my office who patiently endured my ill-temper, my days away, and my preoccupation with this task. Especially I wish to thank the secretaries who patiently taught me to use the computer and assisted me in their "spare" time. Without the support of the staff who work with me, the encouragement of my supervisor, and the understanding of all those with whom I work, it could not have been done.

Special appreciation is expressed to Leila Cantara who has been much more than a typist in this process, whose competent abilities made a very nerve-wracking long-distance process much easier to manage.

Finally, it goes without saying that my family was instrumental in this process. My parents, though no longer with me, instilled in me the belief in myself, the ambition, and the courage to strive for greater goals. And to my grandmother, special love and appreciation are given for all her prayers, for all her support, and, most of all, for always being there for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

ABSTRACT vi

CHAPTERS

I INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 3
Statement of the Problem 3
Delimitations 4
Limitations 5
Justification for the Study 5
Definition of Terms 7
Procedures 9
Selection of the Sample 9
Instrumentation 11
Collection of the Data 13
Treatment of the Data 14
Organization of the Research Report 16

II REVIEW OF THE LITERAUTRE 18

Decision Making Theory 18
Multi-Campus Community College Development and Governance Ideology and Research 25
Multi-Campus Community College Development and Organization 25
Research on Decision Making in Multi-Campus Community Colleges 28
Methods of Research Relative to Locus of Formal Decision Making 37
Summary 46

III PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 47

Respondent Perceptions About the Locus of Decision Making 48
Policy Decisions 48

Allocative Decisions 50
Coordination Decisions 52
Perceptions About Position Incumbent Involvement in Decision Making 54
Policy Decisions 54
Allocative Decisions 67
Coordination Decisions 81
A Comparison of Position Incumbent Involvement in the Decision-Making Process of Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges 96
Comparisons for Policy Decisions 104
Comparisons for Allocative Decisions 105
Comparisons for Coordination Decisions 107
An Analysis of the Extent of Centralization or Decentralization Relative to the Three Areas of Decision Making 110
Summary 113

IV SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 115

Summary 115
Implications 123
Recommendations 127

REFERENCES 129

APPENDICES

A LETTER TO CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER 134

B LETTER TO STUDY PARTICIPANT 136

C SURVEY INSTRUMENT 138

D FOLLOW-UP LETTER 149

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 150

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

THE LOCUS OF POLICY, ALLOCATIVE, AND COORDINATION
DECISIONS IN SELECTED MULTI-CAMPUS
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Donna Elizabeth Miller

August, 1986

Chairman: James L. Wattenbarger
Major Department: Educational Leadership

Three types of decisions, as described by Talcott Parsons (i.e., policy, allocative, and coordination), were identified for use in determining perceptions of administrators and faculty in selected multi-campus community colleges relative to (a) the locus of decision-making for each of the three categories, (b) the position incumbents contributing to the processes used in each, (c) the relationship between size of the institution and position incumbents involved, and (d) the extent of centralization or decentralization in relation to the three categories.

A mail survey utilizing a modified version of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument developed by Eye and associates was sent to a random sample of 33 colleges for distribution to the chief administrative officers at the district-level and at the campuses and to faculty and

lower-level administrators randomly selected from college rosters. Returns were received from 594 respondents representing 27 of the colleges that were sent the materials. The data were analyzed using frequency distributions and one-way analysis of variance.

An analysis of the data revealed that the board of trustees, the campus chief administrative officer, the district chief administrative officer, and the campus academic officer were perceived as final decision makers for all three types of decisions. However, the board of trustees was more involved in policy decisions than in the other types, and policy decisions were made at the district level more often than at the campus level. Allocative and coordination decisions were perceived as being made at the campus level and more frequently involved campus-level position incumbents. The position incumbents identified as participants in all three types of decision-making processes were the faculty, the department chairman, the division chairman, and the campus academic officer. At the .05 level of significance, there was a difference based on school size in the level of involvement of (a) campus chief administrative officers as participants in policy decisions, (b) department chairmen as final decision makers for allocative decisions, and (c) campus chief administrative officers as participants in allocative decisions.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of the community college movement of the early 1960s took a different expansion emphasis late in that decade as many districts created additional campuses to meet the demands of a growing number of students. This trend toward multi-campus community college districts has continued though it has slowed as the recessed economy of recent years necessitated cuts in spending. Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen (1969), in their study of multi-campus districts in the United States, reported in 1968 a total of 40 such districts. By 1983, the number of multi-campus districts had increased to 79 according to the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory of that year. With the increase in number of multi-campus districts came questions and concerns regarding the unique nature of the administration and governance of such districts.

The making of decisions is recognized as the primary task of administration within an organization. Millett (1968) defined governance as "a structure of process of decision-making, within a college or university, about purposes, policies, programs, and procedures" (p. 9). Herbert A. Simon (1960) also supported this premise when he stated that "administration should be concerned with

the processes of decision as well as with the process of action" (p. 1). Griffiths (1959) summed up the issue by declaring that "decision-making is becoming generally recognized as the heart of organization and the process of administration" (p. 75).

Administrators should manage the decision process, not make the decisions (Thompson & Tuden, 1963). The most effective decisions are made by adhering to this proposition (Griffiths, 1959). This act of managing rather than making decisions implies that others must be involved in the decision-making process, that the process must be decentralized. The question then arises as to which members of an organization are involved in decision-making and to what extent the process is centralized or decentralized. A realistic analysis of centralization/decentralization "must include a study of the allocation of decisions in an organization" (Simon, 1957, p. 38). Being more knowledgeable of the specific position incumbents involved in various types of decisions and the level of the organization at which the decision is made would assist the community college administrator in effectively managing the decision-making process.

Talcott Parsons (1960, p. 29) explained the decision-making focus of the operation of an organization in terms of three categories of decision-making: policy, allocative, and coordination. Policy decisions refer to steps taken to attain the goals of the organization. The distribution of responsibilities and fluid resources is the concern of allocative decisions and, finally, coordination decisions involve "maintaining the integration of the organization, through facilitating

cooperation" (p. 30). The study described herein was planned to provide knowledge of the position incumbents in multi-campus community colleges who participated in the process of decision-making relevant to the three categories of decisions. The multi-campus community college districts were compared on the basis of size as determined by the total enrollment reported in the 1983 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory.

The management of multi-campus districts presents problems and concerns different from the problems and concerns of a single institution operation such as those from which most multi-campus districts evolved. As more and more community colleges become multi-campus, an empirical data base regarding these unique aspects of their functioning becomes imperative. While previous studies have targeted specific areas of multi-campus operation such as curriculum and instruction (Holcombe, 1974) and student personnel services (McCluskey, 1972), business operations (Bielen, 1974), and the chief executive's role (Buckner, 1975), this study was designed for the purpose of looking at overall administrative decision-making processes and procedures and was not confined to a specific area of college operations. The central decision-making process is a progressive continuation of the previous research and a logical point to initiate this study.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the locus of formal decision-making in randomly selected multi-campus community college

districts relative to the categories of organizational decision-making identified by Talcott Parsons (1960).

The investigator sought the answers to the following questions:

1. What is the locus of decision-making in the following categories of multi-campus operation: (a) policy, (b) allocation of resources, and (c) coordination?
2. What position incumbents contributed to the formal processes used in these categories of decision-making?
3. Is there a relationship between the size of the institution and the position incumbents involved in specific categories of decision-making?
4. To what extent are the multi-campus community college systems centralized or decentralized in relation to the three categories of decision-making identified herein?

Delimitations

The investigator:

1. Limited the study of the decision-making process relative to the three categories of decision-making in the operation of a multi-campus community college district to a random sample of approximately 35 of the independent, multi-campus systems in the United States.
2. Included in the population only multi-campus community college districts operating as a separate entity from any other portion of higher education within a state as reported in the 1983 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory.

3. Limited data collected to responses to the modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument in instrumentation originally developed by Eye, Lipham, Gregg, Netzer, and Francke (1966).
4. Within selected districts, sent survey instruments to (a) the chief administrative officer (i.e., the president or chancellor); (b) chief campus administrators, (c) selected mid-level campus administrators (i.e., division deans or department chairpersons, and (d) selected faculty members.

Limitations

The following limitations to the study were anticipated:

1. Due to the ex post facto nature of the study, it was limited in the following manner: "(a) the inability to manipulate independent variables, (b) the lack of power to randomize, and (c) the risk of improper interpretation" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 390).
2. The results of the study are generalizable only to multi-campus community college districts included in the population from which the study sample was drawn.

Justification for the Study

As established earlier, decision-making is a central function of administration, and the effective administrator manages the process of decision-making rather than making the decisions (Griffiths, 1959). The implications of these propositions were twofold.

First, they implied that, as a central function of administration, decision-making is a process that should be understood and carried out by all administrators. Much information is available to the administrator regarding the steps necessary to proceed from a problem to a solution.

The second implication is that the process involves more than one member of the organization. Regardless of the procedure used to make a decision, the position incumbents who participate in the decision-making are important to the outcome. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965) reinforced this principle by stating the decision-making process must be subdivided to insure that decisions requiring special knowledge are made by individuals with such knowledge.

The multi-campus community college districts have geographically dispersed operations and multiple administrative layers which create unique decision-making situations. Early in the development of multi-campus districts Kintzer et al. (1969) stated that "as these districts progress through their developmental cycle, the campuses will tend to become more independent and the majority of multi-campus districts will eventually become multi-college districts" (p. 54). The implication of Kintzer and others' prediction is that the multi-campus districts would evolve into campuses with such autonomy that they in fact would be independent colleges. This has not been the case. The question of centralized decision-making versus decentralized decision-making has no clear answer. Therefore, in order to manage more effectively decision-making processes in multi-campus districts,

administrators need information relevant to their situation. This study was designed to make available to multi-campus community college administrators information regarding the decision-making processes and the position incumbents' involvement in decisions regarding policy, allocation of resources, and coordination. The study provided a comparison among decision-making processes in districts grouped according to size based on enrollment to determine any differences or commonalities. If commonalities do exist, they will be available to future researchers in developing guidelines for selecting position incumbents to aid in the decision-making processes within multi-campus community college district operations. This research further adds to the current knowledge base on the management of multi-campus community colleges.

Definition of Terms

Allocative decision. Decision involving the distribution of resources (personnel and financial means) within an organization (Parsons, 1960).

Centralized organizational structure. A decision-making organizational structure in which top-level administrators are involved in the making of most of the decisions affecting the operation of the community college district.

Community college. A two-year postsecondary institution which offers instruction in the following program areas: (a) college parallel, (b) vocational-technical, and (c) continuing education.

Coordination decision. Decision directly affecting or promoting the cooperation of personnel within the organization (Parsons, 1960).

Decentralized organizational structure. A decision-making organization structure in which decisions are made with involvement of a variety of position incumbents and many decisions are the responsibility of campus-level persons or groups.

Final decision maker. The individual or group of individuals assuming responsibility for making the final choice.

Large multi-campus community college. A community college with a reported total enrollment of 20,000-55,000 (one institution in the sample reported an enrollment of 120,000) (Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, 1983).

Locus of decision. The specific position with actual authority for the decision-making process and for making the final decision in specified areas of college operation.

Mid-level administrators. Those administrators at the campus level who are in a line of responsibility above the faculty and below the campus-level chief executive officer. Titles for such positions varied according to community college but included deans, division/department heads, directors, coordinators, and supervisors.

Mid-size multi-campus community college. A community college with a reported total enrollment of 10,000-20,000 (Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, 1983).

Multi-campus. A college district operating two or more geographically dispersed campuses under one governing board and one central administration.

Participant in decision-making. An individual providing information to a decision maker, assisting in identifying alternative solutions, or helping to evaluate alternatives.

Policy decisions. Decisions which directly "commit the organization as a whole to carrying out their implications" (Parsons, 1960, p. 30).

Small multi-campus community college. A community college with a reported total enrollment of 2,000-10,000 (1983 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory).

Top administrator. Chief administrative officer in the district and the chief administrative officer on each campus.

Procedures

The procedures section of the study is divided into four parts. The first part describes how the sample was selected. The second part explains the instrumentation, the instruments used, and their adaptation for the study. The third and fourth sections cover the collection and treatment of the data.

Selection of the Sample

The sample was chosen from the population of all multi-campus community colleges within the delimitations. From the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (1983) a list was compiled of all independent, multi-campus community college districts in the United States, a total of 77 districts. Excluded from the list were multi-campus community college districts that are part of another system, that is, branches of the university system within the state. Numbers were

assigned to the 77 systems within the designated population and by means of a random number table, a sample of approximately half (37) of the designated systems was selected.

The investigator wrote to each selected district informing the chief administrative officer of the selection of the district and requesting a catalog or catalogs from the district for use in data collection. Of the 37 districts, 33 forwarded the requested catalogs and were thus included in the study sample. These catalogs were used to select a representative sample of participants from each district.

The respondents asked to participate in the selected multi-campus community college districts were the following:

1. Chief administrative officer of the district and the chief administrative officer on each campus.
2. Five to eight mid-level administrators selected at random.
3. Five to eight faculty members, representing all campuses with at least one faculty member per campus, selected at random.

A number was assigned to the individuals occupying positions in a specific category within the colleges and by using a random number table the investigator identified a sample for each category of respondents within each district.

Instrumentation

The Decision Point Analysis Instrument, developed by Glen Eye and his associates (1966) and modified for later use by McCluskey (1972), Holcombe (1974), Scaggs (1980), Pfleger (1982), and Rouse (1983), was modified and used as the instrument for data collection. The modifications to the Eye instrument used by the aforementioned researchers were studied and considered for use in the instrument used in the study reported herein. The "don't know" category used by Holcombe, Scaggs, and Pfleger was included for those respondents who did not know the final decision maker or participants for a particular decision item. A telephone interview with Rouse, the researcher most recently known to have used the instrument, resulted in the inclusion of a category for "committees" as a possible response. Since the study reported herein dealt exclusively with multi-campus community colleges the researcher divided the position title response categories into two segments; the district or central office and the campus or college level. She also included an item regarding where in the college a particular decision is made, at the district level, the campus level, or a combination of the two.

A pilot test of the proposed items and the survey instrument was conducted using a comparable group of respondents in a multi-campus community college district not included in the study. The purposes of the pilot test was to investigate the content validity of the decision items and to inquire into the understanding of the format and directions for the instrument. The pilot district was chosen on the

basis of a willingness to participate and accessibility to the researcher. Using a catalog from the pilot district a sample was selected for each respondent category; 4 chief administrative officers, 9 mid-level administrators, and 10 faculty members. The pilot test was conducted during a two day on-site visit to the district.

During the visit, sample survey instruments were distributed to the selected respondents. Half-hour interviews were conducted with each respondent to solicit views and comments regarding the following elements:

1. understanding the format,
2. ease of response,
3. understanding of decision items and terms used to express each item, and
4. the significance of the decision items.

Comments and suggestions obtained from two or more pilot district respondents were incorporated into the revision of specific items, into the directions for completion of the instrument, and into the format design. The decision items were reviewed a second time by a group of five administrators at a second multi-campus district not included in the original sample and additional revisions made in the wording of specific items.

Another consideration in developing the instrument was that it produce data amenable to computer analysis. This was accomplished through precoding the questionnaires and through highly structured possible responses to items.

Collection of the Data

The investigator mailed data collection packets to the office of the chief administrative officer of each college district included in the sample. Each packet included the following items:

1. A cover letter (Appendix A) to the chief administrative officer from the director of the study requesting his or her assistance and cooperation in distributing and collecting the survey instruments.
2. A cover letter (Appendix B) to each study participant from the researcher containing the purpose of the study, the statement of confidentiality, and general instructions.
3. Sufficient survey instruments (Appendix C) to distribute to the selected sample of faculty and administrators.
4. A stamped, self-addressed envelope for return of the surveys.

It was requested that surveys be distributed from the chief administrator's office and returned to his or her office to be mailed together to the researcher. Of the 33 packets mailed, 27 were returned. Response to the initial mailing was 22 with 5 additional packets obtained by means of a follow-up letter (Appendix D). These results represent a district return rate of 82%. This further breaks down into the following categories:

Top administrators	56 of 131 (42.7%)
Mid-level administrators	126 of 207 (60.8%)
Faculty	142 of 256 (55.5%)

Treatment of the Data

The data collected through the Decision Point Analysis Instrument were inspected and analyzed in order to determine the locus of decision making for three types of decisions included in the study (question 1 of the problem statement). In addition, in order to answer question 2 of the problem statement, an analysis was made by inspection of the data and narration of the findings to determine the position incumbents perceived as final decision makers and those perceived as participants in making decisions. Each of these analyses was done for each type of decision included in the Decision Point Analysis Instrument.

Frequency tables were developed to aid in the analysis of these two questions. The first set of data tables is a summary of the responses to the question relative to the locus of decision making for all decision items in the study. The data were compiled by decision type resulting in a table for each type indicating the frequency of the respondents' perception of the location of the decision within the multi-campus organizational structure. A second set of data tables was constructed in order to summarize the number of times the position incumbents were perceived as final decision makers and were perceived as participants in the decision-making process. These tables were constructed by decision type also and were further subdivided by college size. This resulted in a set of eight tables for each decision type--two overall tables and two for each of three college size categories. Also, the position incumbents' perception of their own role in the

decision-making process was summarized and inspected for each type of decision. This resulted in a total of 27 frequency tables used to analyze and inspect the data for question 2 of the study.

An answer was sought to question 3 of the problem statement relative to a relationship between size of the institution and the position incumbents involved in the specific areas of decision making through a comparison of position incumbents for each college size category. The comparison was done by a series of one-way analysis of variance tests for each decision type. The .05 level of significance was used to determine a possible significant difference of position incumbents involved in the various colleges by size category.

For each decision type frequency tables were constructed indicating the average (mean) number of times each position incumbent was perceived to have (a) made the final decision and (b) participated (including making the final decision) in the decision-making process for any decision item used in the study. These tables display the means and standard deviations of the number of final decisions or participations perceived for each of the 15 position incumbents included in the study divided into three groups--those from large size colleges with enrollments of 20,000 or more, those from mid size colleges with enrollments of 10,000-20,000, and those from small colleges with enrollments of 2,000-10,000. Significant difference, if any, was determined by a series of one-way analysis of variance tests comparing, for each position incumbent, the mean number of final decisions or participations perceived by respondents in large-size colleges, mid-size colleges, and small-size colleges.

The final question of the problem statement relative to the extent the multi-campus community college systems are centralized or decentralized in relation to the three areas of decision making (i.e., policy, allocation, and coordination) was answered through a summary and analysis of the previous data tables. A frequency table for each type of decision was designed to summarize the centralized versus decentralized question from the data tables previously constructed to answer the other three problem questions.

Organization of the Research Report

In Chapter I, the problem has been stated, the delimitations and limitations have been defined, definition of terms have been provided, and the justification for pursuing the study has been given. There is also a procedures section which has explained the instrumentation procedure and how the resulting data were treated in order to arrive at answers to the questions of the problem statement.

Chapter II is a presentation of the literature review relative to centralized and decentralized decision-making processes. It also includes a review of research methods used in locus of decision-making studies.

Chapter III is a presentation and analysis of the locus of decision making (question 1) and of position incumbents' involvement in decision-making processes relative to three categories of operation of multi-campus community colleges--policy, allocation, and coordination (question 2). Also included in Chapter III is a comparative study of the frequency of position incumbents' involvement in the decision-making

processes at large colleges, mid-size colleges, and small colleges (question 3). The final analysis of Chapter III deals with the extent of centralization or decentralization relative to the three categories of decision making (question 4).

Chapter IV, the concluding chapter, is a summary of the study and the findings reported herein. It also includes implications drawn from the findings and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is divided into three sections. The first is a review of the literature concerning the decision-making process and the concept of centralized and decentralized decision-making authority. The second section is concerned with the multi-campus community college organization and development and the research related to decision making in these colleges. The focus of section three is methods of research used in locus of decision-making studies.

Decision-Making Theory

This section is a review of the literature concerned with the differences between centralized and decentralized decision-making processes. Although much of this literature is concerned with decision making in business organizations, it has broad applications to educational organizations.

As noted in the above section, a portion of the literature concerned with decision making within organizations focuses on the centralization or decentralization of the process. Is it better for decisions to be made by the central authority within the organization

or is it better for the decisions to be made by members of the organization removed from the central administrative hierarchy? Decisions may be made by individual administrators, by consensus of groups within the organization, or cooperatively through input from groups or individuals to an administrator who makes the decision. Much has been written regarding the physical location of decision making; however, few authors have gone into detail on the specific role incumbents' participating in the decision-making function of the organization.

Griffiths (1959) stated that "the specific function of administration is to develop and regulate the decision-making process in the most effective manner possible" (p. 73). The essence of this assumption is that the function of the executive is to see that the decision-making process proceeds in an effective manner, not, as some would assume, to make the decisions for the organization. As Griffiths constructs his theory of administration, he further proposes that

> 1. If the administrator confines his behavior to making decisions on the decision-making process rather than making terminal decision for the organization, his behavior will be more acceptable to his subordinates.
>
> 2. If the administrator perceives himself as the controller of the decision-making process, rather than the maker of the organization's decisions, the decisions will be more effective. (pp. 90-91)

Simon, in his works of 1957 and 1960, related the administrative process within an organization to the decision-making process. He emphasized that most images of decision making falsely focus on the final moment of choice while ignoring the "whole lengthy, complex

process of alerting, exploring, and analyzing that precedes that final moment" (Simon, 1960, p. 1). In addition to recognizing the decision-making process as a complex interaction of activities, he pointed out that "as a task grows to the point where the efforts of several persons are required to accomplish it . . . it becomes necessary to develop processes for the application of organized effort to the group task" (Simon, 1957, p. 8). Millett (1962) further reinforced the concept of organizational structure contributing to decision-making function in his statement that "organization is built upon the basis of individual and group specialization, individuals and aggregations of individuals contributing a particular skill or process to the realization of the desired purpose" (p. 11).

Simon (1960) proposed that the organization structure is at least a partial specification of those decision-making processes and a logical division for applying organized effort to the group task. His application of organizational structure to the decision-making process decentralizes the functions and involves participants at various levels. Simon's (1960) description of how the organization structure contributes to decision making is as follows:

> The organizational structure establishes a common set of presuppositions and expectations as to which members of the organization are responsible for which classes of decisions; it establishes a structure of subgoals to serve as criteria of choice in various parts of the organization; and it establishes intelligence responsibilities in particular organization units for scrutinizing specific parts of the organization's environment and for communicating events requiring attention to appropriate decision points. (p. 10)

The question of centralized or decentralized decision making becomes an issue of which powers the chief executive wishes to delegate to subordinates and which he or she wishes to keep for him or herself, according to Ernest Dale (1952), an organization theorist to first approach the issue. According to Dale, decentralization "implies the delegation of responsibility and authority from higher management to subordinates down the line" (p. 106). This definition is reinforced by Rossmeier who, in 1976, stated that the main issue in decentralized decision making "is the relative distribution of authority and influence among different individuals, levels, or units of an organization, regardless of the degree to which its facilities and functions are physically decentralized" (p. 78).

Dale's frame of reference was the business organization, but his principles apply as well to educational organizations. Dale (1952) identified the degree of managerial decentralization within an organization by applying the following criteria. Decentralization is the greater

> 1. The greater the number of decisions made lower down the management hierarchy.
> 2. The more important the decisions made lower down the management hierarchy.
> 3. The more functions affected by decisions made at lower levels.
> 4. The less checking required on the decision. Decentralization is greatest when no check at all must be made; still less if superiors have to be consulted <u>before</u> the decision is made. The fewer people to be consulted, and the lower they are on the management hierarchy, the greater the degree of decentralization. (Dale, 1952, p. 107)

Decentralization of decision making occurs for various reasons. Numerous authors (Carhart & Collins, 1977; Carnegie Commission, 1973;

Dale, 1952; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983; Simon, 1957) cite involvement of a greater number of participants and a more valid decision as major advantages to decentralization. It is felt that decentralization brings to bear a greater share of specialized knowledge upon the decision item. Simon (1957) suggested another consideration in decentralization is a time and cost factor. The referral of a decision upward in the hierarchy may be more costly in time since it delays action, as well as in money, since it requires a more highly paid individual to devote time to a particular decision while sacrificing time which may need to be devoted to more important decisions (pp. 236-237). It is noted in at least two works (Richardson, Blocker, & Bender, 1972; Simon, 1977) that it is possible to equate decentralization with integration and autonomy and centralization with bureaucracy, authoritarianism, and direction and control. However, in so doing, a value judgment is placed on the terms, which is unjust. "It is impossible to say in general that either centralization or decentralization is more efficient" (Dale, 1952, p. 109). "Different decisions need to be made in different organizational locations, and the best location for a class of decisions may change as circumstances change" (Simon, 1977, p. 116).

Another issue in the question of centralized or decentralized decision-making is the identification of individuals and groups who participate in the decision-making process. The theoretical basis for participation of various groups is related in this subsection and the research regarding participants in decision-making processes is dealt with in the following section.

Millett (1968) recognized an interdependence of governing boards, administrators, faculty, students, and others who share in the governance of an institution of higher education. Although some areas of decision making require participation by all groups or some groups, other areas are the exclusive purview of one group. Millett proposed that the notion of administration and faculty as antithetical, mutually hostile groups is no longer the case. "What colleges and universities are seeking today is a pattern of shared authority in decision-making" (p. 8). The problem, according to Millett, is to "define what is meant by shared authority and to give that definition concrete meaning in the everyday, continuing operation of a college or university" (p. 5).

The governing board (board of trustees) is recognized as the legal authority for governance of an institution; however, it is also recognized that their authority and responsibility for decision making may be delegated. The president who is appointed by the governing board is the institutional leader and as such plays a key role in the interface between the day-to-day operational needs of the institution and the policy-making aspect of operation. Faculty, according to Millett (1968, 1980) and Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965), should have a voice in the matters concerned with the area of curriculum and instruction and in making the college an effective place of learning. However, Millett (1968) made it quite clear that faculty decision-making in other areas of operation is likely to be "administratively and financially irresponsible" (p. 13). The point

he made was that faculty, in most instances, will not have all the information needed to make informed decisions.

The student is also recognized as a participant in the decision-making process. Millett (1980) noted that the objective of student participation should be "development of responsible citizenship within the academic community on the part of students" (p. 156).

The case for participative decision making is countered by Conway (1984) who investigated the literature and reviewed studies done in the area. The common beliefs regarding the value of participative decision making were, for the most part, refuted by Conway. His conclusion was that acceptance of participative decision-making has been based more on "faith and logic than on the results of well controlled research" (p. 33). He does not propose dismissing the concept, but does recommend that research be initiated to begin building a base for substantiating the claims.

Regardless of whom the decision is made by or what groups are involved, every decision "is based upon individual perceptions of the problem and factors which relate to it" (Blocker et al., 1965, p. 172). Clearly, the literature cited here reflects a need for involvement of more than the central administration of an organization in the decision-making process. It also supports delegation of some decision-making functions. It does not, however, indicate whether there is a trend in incumbents involved in certain decisions or whether there are factors such as size of the institution which relate to the centralization or decentralization of decision making.

Multi-Campus Community College Development and Governance Ideology and Research

This section is divided into two subsections. The first is a review of the writings concerned with the evolution of the multi-campus community college and the issues associated with its development. The second subsection addresses research studies involving multi-campus community colleges.

Multi-Campus Community College Development and Organization

The great growth in multi-campus community colleges occurred during the 1960s and early 1970s following the lead of two very early creators of multi-unit systems, Chicago in 1934, and Los Angeles in 1945. Using the same parameters for identification of multi-campus community colleges as used for this study, Joseph Rossmeier (1976) reported that, in 1964, there were 10 multi-campus systems in operation, by 1968 there were 40, and in 1974 the total had reached 77. In 1983, this number had increased by only two, indicating a lessening of the rapid grwoth phase. This tremendous growth was the result of a greater demand for higher education by a greater portion of the population and the need to make higher education available within a defined geographical area.

Various patterns of organization exist for these multi-campus colleges. Rushing (1970) described three such forms of organization. The descriptions of multi-campus organizations provided by other authors (i.e., Block, 1970; Kintzer, 1972; Richardson, 1973) fit into Rushing's forms. The first is a group of several autonomous colleges under a single board, but with each operating independently of the others.

The second is a multi-campus system organized by function whereby each campus specializes in certain programs such as a center for liberal arts, one for vocational programs, and so forth. The final style of organization described by Rushing is that of a single college operating two or more campuses each of which, usually, constitutes a comprehensive junior college offering both academic and occupational programs (p. 14).

The origins of these multi-campus community colleges are as varied as the styles of organization. A number have developed from single unit colleges in response to suburban growth and development far from an original campus. Others have been the product of a small campus with no space for expansion, and yet a third reason for the origin of a multi-campus community college is that it was planned that way from the beginning (Rushing, 1970, p. 14).

The issues most frequently raised in the literature concerning multi-campus community college administration are those of organization and governance. In many cases, books and journal and periodical articles deal with the authors' experiences in organizing and operating a particular multi-campus college (Baxter & Corcoran, 1972; Masiko, 1966; Rushing, 1970, 1980; Sammartino, 1964; Wygal & Owen, 1975). The methods of governance described by these authors revealed a number of patterns and adaptations of patterns. From Rushing's balance of centralized and decentralized authority, to Masiko's similar blend of the two, to Baxter and Corcoran's management by an executive committee, to Wygal and Owen's governance by committees of the faculty and staff; all offer valid and positive suggestions for organization and governance of a multi-campus college.

Sammartino (1964) wrote one of the first books concerning the issues of multi-campus organization and operation. His personal experience of establishing a main campus in 1942 and then four additional campuses of the institution gave him unique status and a wealth of experience to share. He advocated a centralized form of organization and governance which would maintain an attitude of one college with campuses rather than decentralized control which he believed would result in autonomous institutions with no uniformity of courses or offerings.

The concept of one college with more than one campus is recognized as the most economical and efficient method of management. Kintzer (1972) pointed out the control over duplication of space, equipment, and staff as an advantage of the multi-campus college; and Richardson (1973), in support of centralized governance, noted that this style does not preclude participative district-wide decision-making processes.

Although Masiko (1966) suggested that "different organizational patterns may be needed at the various stages of growth and development of the multi-campus complex" (p. 28), Rushing's two articles, published within three years of the opening of the first campus and after 12 years of operation, suggested otherwise. The experience reported by Rushing was one of no significant changes in management style in the 12 years of operation.

From the literature reviewed and reported herein, it would seem that the governance pattern prevalent in a particular multi-campus community college is determined by many factors, among them the

administrative style of the chief executive and the circumstances of the creation of a multi-campus structure. However, as Wattenbarger (1977) pointed out, much of the literature on decision-making in multi-campus districts is the work of "individuals who are protecting their own concepts or who are using the limited research that is available" (p. 12). Obviously, this situation reinforces the need for managerial theory and the research necessary for documentation.

Research on Decision Making in Multi-Campus Community Colleges

One of the earliest investigations of multi-campus community college organization was reported by Arthur M. Jensen in a 1965 issue of the Junior College Journal. Recognizing the increased demand for higher education and the resulting response by urban community colleges of establishing additional campuses, Jensen undertook a study designed to examine the role of the central offices and the individual campuses in these emerging multi-campus operations. Using a case study method, Jensen interviewed staff members, members of boards of trustees, and local citizens; surveyed official documents and reports; and reviewed the history of each district.

Jensen found that the principal reason for establishing a multi-campus operation in the 10 districts of his investigation were

1. To compensate for district geographical size which prohibited one campus from servicing the district adequately.
2. To equalize educational opportunities through effective accessibility of the college to the residents of the district.
3. To meet the differing educational needs of the various communities located within the district.
4. To accommodate applicants after the district's only campus had reached its maximum capacity.

5. To keep each campus to a reasonable and functional size. (p. 8)

Another finding of the study which seems logical given the above reasons for establishing additional campuses was the trend toward a multi-college organizational plan and a trend among administrators, faculty, and students favoring local autonomy. The various areas of operations were identified and the policies and procedures of each were researched. The area of instruction and curriculum was found to be a joint area of responsibility between the district and the campuses. In all cases the policies and procedures for formation of curriculum objectives were set at the district. Other responsibilities related to curriculum and instruction such as adding or deleting courses, course content, textbook selection, and evaluation and supervision of instruction were shared by the district and campus to varying degrees. The area of student personnel services was considered to be a campus responsibility by all the districts. The district offices in all of those studied had a district level personnel office which established policy and procedures and imposed control over hiring practices. However, in most instances, the campus had the final word in a hiring decision. The areas of plant and facilities and the area of finance were generally considered to be district functions, although the area of community service was the exclusive function of the campus.

Jensen's study was timely in that he looked at the status of an emerging trend. It was valuable to administrators in making available information necessary for the development of future multi-campus districts.

In 1969, Ramstad reported the results of his investigation of 10 multi-campus districts in California. The purpose of his visits to the 10 campuses was to gain insights into the problems and practices associated with the development of multi-campus districts. He used an interview technique to gain information from administrators in each district regarding planning, construction, operation, coordination, and the district office. Generally, there was a great deal of commonality in practices, policies, and procedures among the districts. What Ramstad did not find was a sharing of knowledge and experiences related to multi-campus development and operation. His recommendation was for research to be conducted and workshops, seminars, and conferences held to help others in operating a multi-campus district.

Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen (1969) conducted an extensive research study on 45 multi-campus junior college districts in 17 states. Their monograph, published in 1969 by the American Association of Junior Colleges, reported the results of this investigation into questions regarding leadership and authority in multi-institution districts, relationships between various entities within the district, delegation of responsibility in all areas of operation, and organizational trends in these junior college districts. The section of the study addressing centralized versus decentralized administrative structures was pertinent to this study.

Kintzer and associates (1969) summarized their findings on areas of primary responsibility as follows:

1. "In personnel matters . . . the primary responsibility most often appears to be a prereogative of the college" (p. 25). Often the areas of selection and assignment were stated to be a responsibility shared by college and district-level administrators.

2. Curricular matters are generally a shared responsibility.

3. The college has primary responsibility for course content and textbook selection.

4. Student personnel services is generally under the direct responsibility of the college.

5. District administrators have the primary responsibility in the area of research and planning when related to physical facility planning and utilization. "In educational planning . . . shared responsibility is widely reported" (p. 25).

6. Accreditation-related activities is most often the primary responsibility of the colleges; however, many administrators reported shared responsibility in this area.

7. Both the district and the college-level administrator are equally concerned with the area of publicity.

8. Finance and housekeeping responsibilities are under the realm of the district administrators. "Budget development and budget administration are usually a shared responsibility" (p. 26).

9. "Of the 40 areas listed, many more were cited as primary college responsibility than as primary district responsibility" (p. 26).

While a greater number of respondents favored a decentralized administrative structure in a multi-institution junior college district,

a greater variety of advantages were listed for the centralized form of organization. The advantages of a centralized structure and the advantages of a decentralized structure are summarized from the responses received on a questionnaire developed by Kintzer and associates (1969).

Merits of the centralized administrative structure are as follows:

> 1. Facilitates efficient fiscal control and makes possible economies in purchasing, building construction and maintenance, equipment, space utilization, etc.
> 2. Provides for efficient coordination and use of services of all personnel. Makes possible greater flexibility of staff assignments. . . .
> 3. Results in less wear and tear on the top administrator who can feel more certain that he is in control of the situation. . . .
> 4. Lessens the difficulty of the chief campus administrator in defending certain decisions that have been made by district officers.
> 5. Eliminates the need for a chief executive on each campus.
> 6. Makes equal treatment of all institutional elements easier to achieve the line, thereby minimizing misunderstandings.
> 7. Speeds up implementation of decisions made at the district level and minimizes unproductive dialog.
> 8. Aids achievement of uniformity of practice in areas where it will benefit students.
> 9. Leads to less empire-building on individual campuses.
> 10. Prevents placing too much emphasis on individual institutional prestige and insufficient emphasis on the provision of maximum educational service.
> 11. Facilitates optimal distribution of occupational training programs in accordance with localized needs within the district.
> 12. Facilitates use of district-wide committees in such areas as load, finance, and salary.
> 13. Eases and speeds community contacts and minimizes possibility of a "bad press" resulting from conflicting information disseminated from different institutions within a district.
> 14. Facilitates the work of state officials who deal with junior college districts.
> 15. Effectuates education of, and communication with, the governing board. (pp. 31-32)

The merits of decentralized administrative structures as determined by Kintzer et al. are as follows:

> 1. Encourages college initiative. . . .
> 2. Makes possible stronger rapport with students, greater relevancy of the education program to local community needs, and a quicket response to the changing nature of these needs.
> 3. Fixes responsibility more firmly and thus minimizes "buck passing."
> 4. Places responsibility where it belongs. . . .
> 5. Develops more able leadership among college administrators to whom a greater degree of responsibility has been delegated.
> 6. Improves opportunities for involving personnel in decision-making and thus should strengthen morale.
> 7. Keeps working groups . . . smaller.
> 8. Speeds up many college-level decisions.
> 9. Lessens cost of operation in some respects.
> 10. Facilitates handling of accreditation processes where accrediting associations require separate institutional qualification.
> 11. Results in increased support of a college's activities by its community in that a community's interest in a junior college corresponds somewhat to the degree of separate identity or autonomy an institution has achieved. (pp. 32-33)

Kintzer and associates (1969) concluded that the question should be "what kind of administrative structure enables its personnel to use the district's resources most effectively" (p. 34). They further stated that "the proper balance between autonomy and centralization for one district may not be right for another and, further, that a sharing of responsibility exists to a considerable degree in all multi-institution districts" (Kintzer et al., 1969, p. 35).

Jenkins and Rossmeier (1974) took a look at 12 urban multi-campus community college districts to determine the perceptions of faculty and administrators regarding the distribution of decision-making authority and influence among six organizational levels and representative of five organizational functions. Respondents were also asked to

indicate their perceptions of organizational effectiveness. The authors' aim was to examine relationships among patterns of centralization or decentralization and to determine what actually was taking place in order to suggest how improvements might be facilitated. The areas of organizational function which their decision-making items represented were professional personnel management, student personnel management, budgetary management, program development, and community service management.

Jenkins and Rossmeier (1974) reported there was no evidence to show that the 12 multi-unit community colleges were highly centralized in terms of district versus unit control. What they did find was that the real focus should be more on the relationship existing among organizational levels within units. Therefore, they indicated that "the traditional question of centralization versus decentralization is apparently best replaced by more careful consideration of the optimal patterns of control and authority over different sets of activities" (Jenkins & Rossmeier, 1974, p. 12). The most conclusive finding of this research is that further efforts need to be concentrated upon increasing the participation of staff members at all levels in shaping the organization and directing its activities.

At the suggestion of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the Community College of Denver undertook a review of the administrative organization of the college in 1978. As a part of the review process, Nai-Kwang Chang, Vice President for Research and Development, surveyed 15 community colleges or districts having characteristics generally

comparable to the Community College of Denver. Using a telephone survey method Chang gathered data on the positive and negative aspects of multi-campus colleges versus separate independent colleges and of centralization versus decentralization of 38 administrative functions. Chang found approximately half of the 38 administrative function items investigated showed a propensity towards either centralized or decentralized authority, while the other half revealed no pattern in how they were administered. He found the areas of automated data processing and administration, institutional research, statistical services, district publicity, and personnel records to be generally centralized within the districts he surveyed. Financial aid, student library services, counseling and testing, and health and instructional services reflected a decentralized pattern.

The Aston method of collecting data from formal organizations was used by Henry and Creswell (1983) to examine the levels at which decisions were made in nine decision areas in 26 multi-campus community college systems. The Aston method is an elaborate method of data classification and analysis which the authors adapted from the field of business for application to their study. Using a questionnaire, factual information was solicited from each institution relative to the structure, context, and setting of each organization. These items of information were used to relate the nine decision areas to the system history and the number of system level personnel. The Henry and Creswell (1983) study provides a unique contribution in its method of research. The utility of the results, according to the authors, is

affected by the nature of the limitations to the study. For example, the Aston method looks only at the formal structure of a system. Also, nine select areas of decision-making were used to conform to the Aston approach and they were not necessarily representative of the range of decisions in most community colleges.

In 1984 Kintzer again undertook a study of centralized/decentralized responsibility and authority in multi-unit community colleges. The investigation included inquiry into the areas of primary responsibility, administrative activities involved in the development of practices, and location of primary responsibility. The inquiry forms were sent to 274 multi-unit two-year colleges and institutes and 80 multi-unit district offices in 29 states. With the results from his inquiry he made numerous comparisons. Due to excellent return rates from California he made comparative analyses of these data separate from the rest of the United States. He made comparisons of college results with district results, community college districts with university college central offices, and he compared each of these results in California with non-California results.

Kintzer (1984) had a response from 86 community colleges, 43 of which were California colleges, and from 28 district offices, 11 of which were California districts. Although these data seem much more generalizable to California than to the rest of the United States, Kintzer believes his results illustrate a continuing swing of operational power to the units in multi-campus community colleges. Kintzer concluded that no precise pattern of decision-making can be designed due to the personalized nature of variables. "The appropriate balance of

decision making is largely dependent on the awareness of the district leadership, institutional pride, and the accuracy of the communication system" (Kintzer, 1984, p. 7).

Methods of Research Relative to Locus of Formal Decision Making

The literature was examined for methods and techniques used by researchers in investigating the locus of formal decision-making. The purpose of this examination was to gather ideas for the purpose of conducting the study reported herein.

The origin of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument used in this study was the result of researchers' efforts to identify many of the functions that are essential in the development and support of instructional programs. In 1957, Gley Eye, James Lipham, Russell Gregg, Lanore Netzer, and Donald Francke began researching the literature to create a list of tasks in the supervision or administration of an instructional program. The Decision Point Analysis Instrument was carefully scrutinized, tested, and revised over a period of several years. The final instrument, consisting of 25 decision items related to the administrative areas of student personnel, staff personnel, curriculum, business management, and school-community relations and containing the titles of 10 positions within the school system, asked the following three questions for each decision item: (a) Who makes this decision? (b) What other persons participate in making this decision? (c) What is the nature of your participation in making this decision? Teachers, administrators, and supervisors in 31 school systems were asked to respond to the survey. In a 1966 publication of the University of Wisconsin, Eye and associates reported the results of this study.

Eye and associates (1966) divided the 25 decision items used in their study equally among the five administrative areas; however, the placement of the items in the instrument was random. The decision item instrument was coded to correspond to the biographical data sheet submitted by each respondent so that characteristics could be correlated to decision item analysis without specific identification's being known. The Decision Point Analysis Instrument was administered to the total professional staff of each of the school systems in organized sessions scheduled in advance and conducted by members of the research staff.

The major conclusion drawn from the study conducted by Eye and associates pertinent to the study reported herein concerns the instrument developed and used in the study.

> The Decision Point Analysis Instrument was shown to be a useful device for the assessment and the quantification of these perceptions of the locus of decision-making responsibilities. The location of decision points as perceived by the professional staff in a school system can be identified, measured, and quantified. Based upon the assessment, indices of congruence can be established. The extent of congruence among perceptions of staff members in individual school systems not only can be manipulated but can be improved through such manipulative activities. (Eye et al., 1966, p. 204)

In 1972, McCluskey completed the first of a series of research studies at the University of Florida related to the locus of formal decision-making for various areas of operation in multi-campus community colleges. McCluskey investigated decision making in regard to specific tasks of student personnel services. The questions McCluskey sought answers to concerned the specific tasks

of student personnel services in multi-unit community college districts, the procedures for making decisions in the student personnel area, and the role incumbents who make decisions regarding specific tasks in student personnel services. McCluskey collected data using a Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument and a structured interview guide in three multi-campus community colleges chosen on the basis of criteria such as institutional size, date of founding, and state governance structure. The particular role incumbents asked to participate in each college were the chief administrator for the district, the chief administrator for student personnel services for the district, the chief student personnel administrator for each campus, the chief campus administrator from each campus, and seven to nine counselors randomly selected and representative of the number of campuses in each college.

McCluskey (1972) developed a Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument using Glen Eye and associates' basic format and design. He used random distribution to place an equal number of items in each of five areas of student personnel services administration on the survey instrument. He used the 10 positions as Eye did but modified the position titles to reflect those common to community colleges. In addition, he developed a structured interview guide to be used in interviewing the chief administrator of the district and each of the campuses, and the student personnel services administrator at the district and on each campus during on-site visits to the three colleges. The Modified Instrument with a cover letter of explanation, instructions,

and a backgroun data sheet were mailed to the colleges prior to the visits with a request that it be completed before the researcher's arrival.

McCluskey found that the primary decision makers responsible for the specific areas of student personnel services varied according to the organizational structure of the district. In the two districts utilizing district administrators for student personnel services they were primary decision makers for student services and the campus student personnel services administrators in all three districts were identified as primary decision makers. A significant participant in the decision-making process in all three districts was the campus administrator for student personnel services.

McCluskey observed also that the two districts which had district-level administrators for student personnel services had some decisions centralized and others decentralized while in the one district with no district-level administrators the decision-making for student personnel services is largely a campus responsibility. District-wide committees were utilized in all districts studied but there was considerable variation in their scope and involvement.

McCluskey's selection of colleges based on a willingness to participate greatly limited the use of the results of his study. His data might have been more valid had he used a random sample technique for selecting the participating colleges. However, his technique has been revised and replicated numerous times marking his contribution as a significant one.

Two years later, Holcombe (1974) did a similar study with emphasis on decision making for curriculum and instruction in multi-campus community colleges. Holcombe's procedure closely followed McCluskey's, using the Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument and a structured interview guide. Holcombe also limited his study to three schools which he visited in order to examine documents and interview the study participants. The Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument was revised by reducing the number of possible response positions from 10 to 7 and adding a "don't know" response for participants who did not know who made or participated in a particular decision. The number of decision items for each category was five, but since Holcombe had only two categories, curriculum and instruction, his total number of decision items was reduced to 10. The instrument included a cover letter of explanation, instructions, and a background data sheet and was presented to the participant for completion prior to the interview. By using this technique, Holcombe was able to accomplish a 100% return rate and was also able to clarify any questions of semantics which might have confused a participant's understanding of a specific item. The role incumbents who participated in the study at each college were the chief administrator and chief administrator for academic affairs for the entire college, the chief campus administrator and chief campus administrator for academic affairs for each campus, and division/ department chairmen and faculty representatives from all campuses.

Holcombe found that the primary decision makers at each college in the areas of curriculum and instruction varied as the organizational pattern varied. In the college which had campus deans of instruction

exclusively responsible for curriculum and instruction, those individuals were perceived to be the primary decision makers. At the remaining two colleges that had no comparable position the primary decision makers were the department and division chairmen. Chief administrators for the entire college or at the campus level were not found to have decision-making responsibility in either of the areas addressed in Holcombe's study. Faculty were not strong in the area of curriculum decisions, but were ranked just behind the department chairmen as primary decision makers in the area of instruction.

Scaggs (1980) investigated decision-making processes involved in curriculum change using the same instrument as McCluskey and Holcombe. However, the procedure she used was different in that she conducted her study by mail. Using the 28 community colleges which comprise the Florida system, she selected the college president, chief academic administrator, chief business administrator, selected department chairmen, and selected faculty in each as participants in her research. She mailed a survey packet containing a cover letter, a questionnaire, a card for requesting results of the study, and a self-addressed stamped envelope directly to each respondent by name. The personal nature of using the participant's name was believed to affect the response in a positive manner. When a first mailing did not result in the 60% return she had determined adequate, Scaggs sent a follow-up letter and additional survey materials to the selected respondents. This resulted in a better than 60% return rate for all groups except the faculty.

The Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument Scaggs used contained 9 decision items concerned with curriculum change and 12 position titles as possible responses. She retained the "don't know" category added by Holcombe for respondents who had no knowledge of the decision maker for a particular item.

Scaggs found the president was chosen as the final decision maker most frequently over all decision items with the academic dean and the institutional academic vice president the next most frequently named. Surprisingly, 21% of the respondents indicated they did not know who had authority for final decisions. When these data were broken down by respondent status groups, the central administrators tended to identify the president as the final decision maker more often than faculty or department chairmen did. Scaggs also compared responses by college size and found a significant difference with small colleges reporting the president as final decision maker more frequently than the large colleges.

As is often the case with survey research, Scaggs asked a number of questions which generated a large number of comparative analyses and caused the results to be somewhat confusing to interpret. Results might have been more easily understood had she limited the questions and the variables.

A study using the Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument to investigate the locus of formal decision making relative to the operation of an instructional program provided by an outside agency within selected school systems was carried out by James Pfleger (1982).

Pfleger's area of study was Naval Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (NJROTC) and he used the five more successful units and the five less successful units in each of three regions as the basis of his study. On-site visits were made to six schools randomly selected by the researcher, three from the more successful group and three from the less successful group. During these visits, the principal, the assistant principal, the counselor, the naval science instructor, the assistant naval science instructor, and the three senior ranking cadets were interviewed using a structured interview guide. They were also asked to complete a Decision Point Analysis Instrument at the beginning of the interview. The Decision Point Analysis Instrument was mailed to the naval science instructor in the remaining 24 schools included in the sample with a request for distribution to the principal and the senior ranking cadet.

Pfleger's instrument modification was of relevance to the study reported herein. He developed a list of decision items which were reviewed by naval science instructors not included in the study sample. Any item chosen by four of the five reviewers was included for a total of 19 items which were not categorized in any manner. Pfleger included a question regarding the respondent's level of participation for each decision item in his survey. He reported the responses to this item only when the role incumbents did not consider themselves as final decision makers or active participants in the decision-making process. Of the two choices he reported, a vast majority considered themselves to have no involvement in the decision-making process.

The subjects of Rouse's locus of decision-making study in 1984 were the 69 institutions which were members of the Christian College Coalition. He used a total of 19 items on the Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument representing the four areas of academics, student affairs, development, and administration. The position titles used as responses on the questionnaire were also the role incumbents from whom responses were solicited. Rouse eliminated the "don't know" response used by others, substituting for it an "other" category of response which he asked to be identified when used as a response for a particular item. The most frequent identification of the "other" category was for a committee as the decision maker or as the participant in making the decision.

The results of Rouse's study were reported by the areas of decision-making he investigated within the Christian Colleges. The respondents perceived the president to be involved in making all types of decisions within the college; however, the role incumbents perceived as decision makers with the president varied according to the area of decision making. In the academic area, the trustees, academic dean, and faculty were perceived as most often making decisions along with the president. Student affairs decisions involved the president and dean of students, and decisions concerning developmental affairs were made by the trustees, the presidents, business officers, and development officers. Administrative decisions were perceived to be the exclusive responsibility of the trustees and presidents. As a group, administrators were seen as having a high level of participation in the area of administrative decisions.

The five dissertations reviewed were primarily of assistance in developing the Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument used in the study reported herein. The format of the instruments used by Scaggs (1980) and Rouse (1983) provided a framework for development of the format of the instrument used in the study reported herein. The procedures for data collection and interpretation used by all the previous researchers were useful in developing the methods used in this study.

Summary

The decision-making process, in general, and specifically as related to multi-unit organizations, is the emphasis for this review of literature. The first section deals with the theories of decision making as a function of administration and with the centralization or decentralization or this function. Multi-campus community college organization and administration is the topic of the second section including a review of relevant research on multi-campus community college decision-making structures and processes. The third and final section is a review of previously done studies using similar techniques to those used for the study reported herein.

CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Chapter III is a presentation and analysis of the data collected concerning the position incumbents involved in decision making in three categories of multi-campus community college operation; policy, allocation of resources, and coordination. The chapter is divided into four major sections, each one addressing one of the four questions from the statement of the problem. The first section contains a presentation and analysis of the data obtained from the Decision Point Analysis Instrument relative to the locus of decision making for each type of decision. The second section is also a presentation and analysis of the data obtained through the Decision Point Analysis Instrument relative to the respondents' perceptions of (a) final decision makers and (b) participants in the decision-making process for the three types of decisions. Section III is an analysis of the differences in frequency as final decision makers or participants as perceived by study respondents from multi-campus community colleges classified as large, mid-size, or small. The final section is an analysis and discussion of the extent to which the decision-making processes are centralized or decentralized in relation to the three types of decisions.

Respondent Perceptions About the Locus of Decision Making

Question 1 of the statement of the problem relative to the locus of decision making in three categories of operation in multi-campus community colleges is answered in this section. Question C for each item of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument (see Appendix C) asked "where in your college is this type of decision made." The possible responses were "always district," "more often district than campus," "both levels equally," "more often campus than district," and "always campus." This section is divided according to the three categories of decision making--policy, allocation of resources, and coordination. The subsections contain data summarizing the responses to the question regarding the locus of decision making for each set of decision items. Data are presented as frequency tables and analyzed by inspection and narration.

Policy Decisions

The perceptions of respondents relative to the locus of decision making for policy decisions is summarized in Table 1. For each decision item, the number of respondents who perceived a particular location to be the locus of decision making is reported as well as the percentage of the total responses for that decision item that the number represents. Overall totals and percentages for the decision type (i.e., policy) are also given.

For policy-type decisions the greatest number of participants reporting a particular location was for the "always district" response (35.4% of the responses). The remaining 65% of the responses are

Table 1

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Locus of Decision Making for Policy Decisions

	LOCUS OF DECISION MAKING											
	Always District		More Often District Than Campus		Both Levels Equally		More Often Campus Than District		Always Campus Level		Totals	
Decision Relative To	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree.	99	31.4	47	14.9	67	21.3	67	21.3	35	11.1	315	100.0
7. Establishing the calendar for an academic year.	183	58.5	47	15.0	54	17.3	21	6.7	8	2.6	313	100.0
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty.	30	9.4	17	5.3	29	9.1	114	35.6	130	40.6	320	100.0
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services.	88	30.0	64	21.9	47	16.1	58	19.9	35	12.0	292	100.0
12. Establishing standards for admission.	134	45.4	50	16.9	57	19.3	35	11.9	19	6.4	295	100.0
15. Creating a new program of study.	120	38.2	36	11.5	63	20.1	77	24.5	18	5.7	314	100.0
TOTALS	654	35.4	261	14.1	317	17.1	372	20.1	245	13.2	1849	99.9

evenly distributed throughout the other four possible location categories; however, if the two categories representing the district are totaled and compared to the total of the two categories representing the campus, the majority of responses (915 versus 617) are for the district level.

When the data for specific decision items are inspected, one item (#9) stands out as discrepant from the other policy decision items. The majority (75%) of responses to this item were at the campus level. Since the study was done by mail and there was no opportunity to query participants about their understanding of an item, an explanation of the discrepancy cannot be obtained. However, a suggested explanation of these results is that the respondents' understanding of the item differed from the meaning the researcher intended to convey.

Allocative Decisions

Table 2 summarizes the response to the Decision Point Analysis Instrument question relative to the locus of decision making for allocative decision items. The respondents' perception of the locus for decision-making for the allocative decision items was most frequently at the campus level. A majority of the responses, 53%, were for the categories related to campus-level versus a 29.5% response for the two categories related to a district-level decision location. The inspection of data for individual decision items indicates two items where differences in response can be noted.

The data for item #10 relative to the relocation or reassignment of faculty within the college district show a majority of respondents

Table 2

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Locus of Decision-Making for Allocative Decisions

Decision Relative To	LOCUS OF DECISION MAKING: Always District no.	%	More Often District Than Campus no.	%	Both Levels Equally no.	%	More Often Campus Than District no.	%	Always Campus Level no.	%	Totals no.	%
2. Spending funds budgeted for audio-visual equipment.	24	7.6	28	8.9	37	11.7	130	41.1	97	30.7	316	100.0
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program.	42	13.7	47	15.3	80	26.1	100	32.6	38	12.4	307	100.0
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds.	17	5.8	22	7.6	24	8.2	82	28.2	146	50.2	291	100.0
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty within the college district.	85	28.8	66	22.4	80	27.1	44	14.9	20	6.8	295	100.0
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit.	80	25.9	64	20.7	58	18.8	66	21.4	41	13.3	309	100.0
17. The instructional budget request within a department/division.	39	12.6	25	8.1	40	12.9	100	32.3	106	34.2	310	100.0
TOTALS	287	15.7	252	13.8	319	17.4	522	28.6	448	24.5	1828	100.0

(51%) locating that decision at the district level compared to only 21% reporting it to be at the campus level. Although not by as great a majority, the same reversal of the overall data is indicated by the response to item #16. The respondents perceived the decision to allocate new faculty positions to an instructional unit to be made at the district level 46.5% of the time and at the campus level 34.7% of the time. The response to the remaining four decision items is consistent with the overall responses.

Coordination Decisions

The location of decisions regarding the coordination function of the multi-campus community college is reported in Table 3. The overall totals indicate respondents perceived this type of decision to be made more frequently at the campus level (48.5% of the time) than at the district level (30.4%). The data for specific decision items varied in some instances from the overall totals.

Decision item #5 relative to awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes is perceived by respondents to be decided more frequently at the district level (40.4% of the time) than at the campus level (33.4%). While data for decision item #13, awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member, are consistent with the overall totals when the two district and the two campus response categories are totaled, it should be noted that the response category marked with the greatest frequency was always district (30.4% of the time). The virtually equal frequencies of response between district and campus for decision item #14, implementing

Table 3

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Locus of Decision-Making for Coordination Decisions

Decision Relative To	LOCUS OF DECISION MAKING: Always District no.	%	More Often District Than Campus no.	%	Both Levels Equally no.	%	More Often Campus Than District no.	%	Always Campus Level no.	%	Totals no.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member.	17	5.4	19	6.0	19	6.0	79	25.0	182	57.6	316	100.0
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member.	59	19.5	24	7.9	72	23.8	90	29.8	57	18.9	302	100.0
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes.	92	29.3	35	11.1	82	26.1	54	17.2	51	16.2	314	100.0
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member.	91	30.4	20	6.7	58	19.4	70	23.4	60	20.1	299	100.0
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program.	58	19.5	60	20.2	58	19.5	82	27.6	39	13.1	297	100.0
18. Involving faculty in decision making process.	34	11.5	46	15.5	95	32.1	85	28.7	36	12.2	296	100.0
TOTALS	351	19.2	204	11.2	384	21.0	460	25.2	425	23.3	1824	99.9

board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program, should also be noted. The district level categories were perceived as the location for this decision item 39.7% of the time and the campus level categories were indicated 40.7% of the time.

Perceptions About Position Incumbent Involvement In Decision Making

This section addresses question 2 of the problem statement relative to the position incumbents contributing to the formal processes of decision making for each of the three categories of decision making previously identified. The organization of this section is by decision type.

In each subsection the data or final decision makers are presented and analyzed by inspection and narration separate from the data regarding participants in the decision-making process. Further, there is a presentation of data from all respondents, as well as data presentation by school size in order that any variations by school size may be noted. Each subsection concludes with information relative to the respondents' perceptions of their involvement in the decision-making process. Frequency tables are included to provide a summary of the data collected.

Policy Decisions

Policy decisions are those decisions which directly "commit the organization as a whole to carrying out their implications" (Parsons, 1960, p. 30). The decision items included in the Modified Decision Point Analysis Instrument (see Appendix C) which pertained to the policy-making function of the operation of multi-campus community colleges were item numbers 1, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 15.

Data collected from all respondents. Table 4 is a summary of the responses to the question regarding final decision makers for those decision items. The data were obtained from 324 respondents representing 27 multi-campus community colleges nationwide. The survey respondents were top administrators such as the chief administrative officer at the district level and at the campus level, mid-level administrators such as division and department chairment, and faculty members. The Decision Point Analysis Instrument allowed multiple responses to the questions regarding final decision makers and participants in the decision making. Therefore, the row totals in the frequency tables provided will vary.

The entires in Table 4 are the number of times the listed position incumbents were perceived to be final decision makers for each of the decision items representing a policy-type decision. Next to each number is the percentage of the total for that particular decision item which the number represents. For instance, the first entry (188) indicates that 188 respondents perceived the board of trustees to be the final decision maker for establishing requirements for a degree. The 188 responses represent 20.4% of the total responses for decision item 1, establishing requirements for a degree.

All respondents perceived the board of trustees to be the primary decision maker for policy-type decisions as a group. The board of trustees were perceived to be final decision makers 17.4% of the time followed by the campus chief administrative officer (15.3%), the district chief administrative officer (13.1%), and the campus academic

Table 4

Perceptions of All Respondents Relative to the Position Incumbents Involved in Making Policy Decisions

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	188	20.4	98	10.6	2	.2	70	7.6	66	7.2	3	.3	7	.8	118	12.8	3	.3	112	12.1	11	1.2	46	5.0	51	5.5	58	6.3	69	7.5	3	.3	12	1.3	5	.5	922	99.9
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	167	20.1	127	15.3	14	1.7	78	9.4	87	10.5	13	1.6	26	3.1	108	13.0	8	1.0	64	7.7	30	3.6	15	1.8	8	1.0	31	3.7	27	3.2	1	.1	11	1.3	17	2.0	838	100.1
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	82	9.0	101	11.7	17	1.9	74	8.1	3	.3	1	.1	6	.7	150	16.4	11	1.2	191	20.5	4	.4	122	13.1	115	12.3	22	2.4	4	.4	0	.0	7	.8	2	.3	912	99.5
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	140	17.0	120	14.5	145	17.6	14	1.7	12	1.5	8	1.0	6	.7	153	18.5	95	11.5	31	3.8	33	4.0	5	.6	3	.4	4	.5	8	1.0	5	.6	3	.4	40	4.8	825	100.3
12. Establishing standards for admission	194	20.7	124	13.2	4	.4	90	9.6	52	5.6	12	1.3	25	2.7	132	14.1	1	.1	106	11.3	54	5.8	32	3.4	27	2.9	28	3.0	33	3.5	1	.1	7	.7	14	1.5	936	99.9
15. Creating new program of study	191	17.2	157	14.2	13	1.2	100	9.0	54	4.9	3	.3	5	.5	186	16.8	6	.5	149	13.5	5	.5	76	6.9	57	5.1	45	4.1	45	4.1	0	.0	6	.7	7	.6	1107	100.1
TOTALS	962	17.4	727	13.1	195	3.5	426	7.7	274	5.0	40	.7	75	1.4	847	15.3	124	2.2	653	11.8	137	2.5	296	5.3	261	4.7	188	3.4	186	3.4	10	.2	48	.9	85	1.5	5534	100.0

officer (11.8%). These findings generally support the literature (Blocker et al., 1965; Millett, 1968, 1980) which indicates the responsibility for the policy-making function of an institution rests with the governing board and the chief administrative officer.

It is noted, however, that decision item 9 does not fit the patterns of the other policy-type decision items. The primary decision makers for meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty are perceived to be the campus academic officer, the campus chief administrative officer, and the department chair. Since the survey was done entirely by mail, there was no opportunity to ascertain the respondents' understanding of an item. An explanation for the different response to decision item 9 could be respondent misinterpretation of the meaning of the item.

The perceptions of respondents as to the final decision makers for decision item 11 related to providing or contracting ancillary services included primary involvement by the district and the campus business officers. Given the nature of the decision item, including these position incumbents as final decision makers is not out of order.

The Decision Point Analysis Instrument included a second question relative to participants in the decision making process for each item. Table 5 is a summary of the responses to this question for policy decision items. The positions most frequently participating in policy decision-making are faculty (13.2% of the time), campus academic officer (12.1%), division chairmen (10.2%), and department chairmen (9.5%). The perceptions of participation in policy

Table 5

Perceptions of All Respondents Relative to the Position Incumbents Participating in Making Policy Decisions

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																							
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Department Chairmen		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	9	.9	75	7.2	12	1.2	74	7.1	68	6.5	14	1.3	9	.9	74	7.1	5	.5	111	10.7	41	3.9	124	11.9	110	10.6	171	16.4	112	10.8	17	1.6	12	1.2	3	.3	1041	100.1
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	10	1.6	55	8.8	23	3.7	40	6.4	37	5.9	16	2.5	6	.9	78	12.4	18	2.9	100	15.9	52	8.3	46	7.3	31	4.9	53	8.4	38	6.1	17	2.7	5	.8	3	.5	628	100.0
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	11	2.4	17	3.7	16	3.5	19	4.1	9	1.9	1	.2	3	.7	47	10.2	18	3.9	46	10.0	10	2.2	72	15.7	80	17.4	89	19.3	11	2.4	2	.4	6	1.3	3	.7	460	100.0
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	7	1.5	52	11.5	53	11.7	17	3.8	8	1.8	12	2.6	5	1.1	47	10.4	57	12.6	48	10.6	55	12.1	15	3.3	13	2.9	12	2.6	31	6.8	13	2.9	2	.4	6	1.3	453	99.9
12. Establishing standards for admission	7	.9	62	8.5	9	1.2	49	6.7	38	5.2	26	3.6	1	.1	66	9.0	6	.8	99	13.5	73	10.0	67	9.2	60	8.2	92	12.6	55	7.5	13	1.8	4	.5	4	.5	731	99.8
15. Creating new program of study	9	1.0	61	6.7	30	3.3	61	6.7	48	5.3	6	.7	4	.4	75	8.3	18	2.0	106	11.7	21	2.3	107	11.8	106	11.7	139	15.4	83	9.2	22	2.4	6	.7	2	.2	904	99.8
TOTALS	53	1.3	322	7.6	143	3.4	260	6.2	208	4.9	75	1.8	28	.7	387	9.2	122	2.9	510	12.1	252	6.0	431	10.2	400	9.5	556	13.2	330	7.8	84	2.0	35	.8	21	.5	4217	100.1

decision making are clearly at the campus level (74%) and not from the district or central office level (26%).

The exceptions to the total perceived participants are for division items 7, 11, and 12. Response to all these decision items includes the student affairs officer as a primary participant. Again, the nature of the items would explain this inclusion.

Data reported by college size categories. Tables 6-11 summarize the data for the policy decision items by college size groupings. The multi-campus community colleges randomly selected for the study fell very evenly and clearly into three groups defined by using enrollment figures from the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. The definition of each size category is found in Chapter I.

The data for policy-type decisions when broken out by college size result in the same position incumbents as final decision makers as the data from all respondents. The board of trustees is perceived as the primary final decision maker for policy decisions in all three categories. Although the order changes when the data are divided by size category, the other position incumbents indicated as final decision makers in the data from all respondents (i.e., campus chief administrative officer, campus academic officer, and district chief administrative officer) appear for each size category.

When the school size data are analyzed by decision item, only minor differences appear; however, certain of these are noteworthy. In large schools the local campus committee was perceived as a final decision maker (10.6% of the time) following board of trustees (17%) and the

Table 6

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Policy Decisions in Large Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Depart-ment Chairmen		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	69	17.0	37	9.1	1	.2	28	6.9	38	9.4	0	.0	2	.5	49	12.1	1	.2	43	10.6	2	.5	25	6.2	30	7.4	29	7.1	43	10.6	2	.5	5	1.2	2	.5	406	100.0
2. Establishing calendar for academic year	69	20.1	47	13.7	8	2.3	28	8.1	32	9.3	4	1.2	22	6.4	36	10.5	3	.9	27	7.8	8	2.3	4	1.2	4	1.2	18	5.2	16	4.7	1	.3	8	2.3	9	2.6	344	100.1
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	36	9.6	28	7.4	6	1.6	29	7.7	2	.5	0	.0	2	.5	51	13.6	4	1.1	75	19.9	2	.5	56	14.9	65	17.3	15	4.0	0	.0	0	.0	4	1.1	1	.3	376	100.0
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	58	16.7	42	12.1	75	21.6	5	1.4	6	1.7	3	.9	5	1.4	51	14.7	46	13.3	13	3.7	12	3.5	3	.9	1	.3	3	.9	4	1.2	2	.6	0	.0	18	5.2	347	100.1
12. Establishing standards for admission	79	21.5	49	13.3	1	.3	32	8.7	23	6.3	4	1.1	18	4.9	47	12.8	1	.3	42	11.4	16	4.3	9	2.4	10	2.7	10	2.7	17	4.6	0	.0	1	.3	9	2.4	368	100.0
15. Creating new program of study	72	14.7	61	12.4	8	1.6	41	8.4	29	5.9	1	.2	2	.4	75	15.3	3	.6	67	13.6	2	.4	39	7.9	32	6.5	23	4.7	30	6.1	0	.0	3	.6	3	.6	491	99.9
TOTALS	383	16.4	264	11.3	99	4.2	163	7.0	130	5.6	12	.5	51	2.2	309	13.3	58	2.5	267	11.4	42	1.8	136	5.8	142	6.1	96	4.2	110	4.7	5	.2	21	.9	42	1.8	2332	99.9

Table 7

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers For Policy Decisions in Mid Size Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																			
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Department Chairmen		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	54	20.1	24	8.9	0	.0	26	9.7	14	5.2	1	.4	5	1.9	34	12.6	2	.7	38	14.1	3	1.1	14	5.2	12	4.5	18	6.7	17	6.3	1	.4	4	1.5	2	.7	269	100.0
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	44	18.6	34	14.3	3	1.3	26	11.0	36	15.2	4	1.7	2	.8	30	12.6	4	1.7	22	9.3	4	1.7	7	3.0	3	1.3	3	1.3	10	4.2	0	.0	2	.8	3	1.3	237	100.1
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	29	10.4	35	12.6	9	3.2	28	10.1	1	.4	1	.4	2	.7	41	14.7	4	1.4	48	17.3	2	.7	46	16.5	23	8.3	5	1.8	4	1.4	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	278	99.9
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	35	15.9	37	16.8	37	16.8	5	2.3	2	.9	5	2.3	1	.5	37	16.8	24	10.9	6	2.7	8	3.6	0	.0	0	.0	1	.5	4	1.8	2	.9	1	.5	15	6.8	220	100.0
12. Establishing standards for admission	52	18.3	35	12.3	2	.7	35	12.3	18	6.3	6	2.1	1	.4	33	11.6	0	.0	38	13.4	16	5.6	15	5.3	8	2.8	9	3.2	11	3.9	1	.4	2	.7	2	.7	284	100.0
15. Creating new program of study	50	17.1	41	14.0	3	1.0	33	11.3	15	5.1	1	.3	1	.3	48	16.4	3	1.0	43	14.7	1	.3	22	7.5	7	2.4	10	3.4	10	3.4	0	.0	2	.7	3	1.0	293	99.9
TOTALS	264	16.7	206	13.0	54	3.4	153	9.7	86	5.4	18	1.1	12	.8	223	14.1	37	2.3	195	12.3	34	2.2	104	6.6	53	3.4	46	2.9	56	3.5	4	.3	11	.7	25	1.6	1581	100.0

Table 8

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers For Policy Decisions in Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Department Chairmen		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	65	26.3	37	15.0	1	.4	16	6.5	14	5.7	2	.8	0	.0	35	14.2	0	.0	31	12.6	6	2.4	7	2.8	9	3.6	11	4.4	9	3.6	0	.0	3	1.2	1	.4	247	99.9
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	54	21.5	46	18.3	3	1.2	24	9.6	19	7.6	5	2.0	2	.8	42	16.7	1	.4	15	6.0	18	7.2	4	1.6	1	.4	10	4.0	1	.4	0	.0	1	.4	5	2.0	251	100.1
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	17	6.6	38	14.7	2	.8	17	6.6	0	.0	0	.0	2	.8	58	22.5	3	1.2	68	26.4	0	.0	20	7.8	27	10.5	2	.8	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.2	1	.4	258	100.3
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	47	18.2	41	15.9	33	12.8	4	1.6	4	1.6	0	.0	0	.0	65	25.2	25	9.7	12	4.6	13	5.0	2	.8	2	.8	0	.0	0	.0	1	.4	2	.8	7	2.7	258	100.1
12. Establishing standards for admission	63	22.2	40	14.1	1	.4	23	8.1	11	3.9	2	.7	6	2.1	52	18.3	0	.0	26	9.2	22	7.7	8	2.8	9	3.2	9	3.2	5	1.8	0	.0	4	1.4	3	1.1	284	100.2
15. Creating new program of study	69	21.4	55	17.0	2	.6	26	8.0	10	3.1	1	.3	2	.6	63	19.5	0	.0	39	12.1	2	.6	15	4.6	18	5.6	12	3.7	5	1.5	0	.0	3	.9	1	.3	323	99.8
TOTALS	315	19.4	257	15.8	42	2.6	110	6.8	58	3.6	10	.6	12	.7	315	19.4	29	1.8	191	11.8	61	3.8	56	3.4	66	4.1	44	2.7	20	1.3	1	.06	16	1.0	18	1.1	1621	99.9

Table 9

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Policy Decision Making at Large Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Depart-ment Chairmen		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	3	.8	21	5.7	6	1.6	31	8.4	28	7.6	3	.8	5	1.4	22	6.0	2	.5	36	9.7	13	3.5	39	10.5	41	11.1	67	18.1	38	10.3	7	1.9	6	1.6	2	.4	370	99.9
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	3	1.6	18	9.6	5	2.7	11	5.8	18	9.6	4	2.1	6	3.2	24	12.8	6	3.2	24	12.8	11	5.8	13	6.9	5	2.7	21	11.2	13	6.9	5	2.7	0	.0	1	.5	188	100.1
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	5	3.2	7	4.5	4	2.6	6	3.9	3	1.9	0	.0	1	.7	14	9.0	7	4.5	14	9.0	3	1.9	23	14.8	20	12.9	36	23.2	6	3.9	0	.0	5	3.2	1	.7	155	99.9
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	1	.7	18	13.0	18	13.0	2	1.4	4	2.9	6	4.3	5	3.6	10	7.2	20	14.4	11	7.9	9	6.5	5	3.6	4	2.9	3	2.2	13	9.4	6	4.3	1	.7	3	2.2	139	100.2
12. Establishing standards for admission	3	1.3	18	7.6	4	1.7	17	7.2	15	6.4	8	3.4	1	.4	21	8.9	2	.9	27	11.4	18	7.6	25	10.6	21	8.9	27	11.4	20	8.5	5	2.1	2	.9	2	.9	236	100.1
15. Creating new program of study	2	.6	18	5.4	11	3.3	23	6.9	23	6.9	1	.3	3	.9	24	7.2	9	2.7	34	10.5	4	1.2	36	10.8	43	13.0	59	17.8	32	9.6	8	2.4	1	.3	0	.0	332	99.8
TOTALS	17	1.2	100	7.0	48	3.4	90	6.3	91	6.4	22	1.6	21	1.5	115	8.1	115	8.1	46	3.2	147	10.4	58	4.1	141	9.9	134	9.4	213	15.0	133	8.6	31	2.2	15	1.1	1420	100.0

Table 10

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Policy Decision Making at Mid-Size Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Department Chairment		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	1	.3	19	6.4	1	.3	21	7.1	22	7.4	4	1.4	1	.3	17	5.7	2	.7	30	10.1	7	2.4	46	15.5	33	11.1	50	16.8	35	11.8	4	1.4	3	1.0	1	.3	297	100.0
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	1	.6	12	6.7	8	4.4	15	8.3	12	6.7	6	3.3	0	.0	17	9.4	6	3.3	27	15.0	13	7.2	16	8.9	12	6.7	10	5.6	10	5.6	7	3.9	4	2.2	2	1.1	180	100.0
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	3	2.0	5	3.2	3	2.0	7	4.6	4	2.6	0	.0	2	1.3	13	8.4	5	3.2	17	11.0	1	.6	24	15.6	33	21.4	30	19.5	5	3.3	1	.6	0	.0	1	.6	154	99.9
11. Providing or contracting ancillary services	2	1.7	12	10.0	15	12.5	6	5.0	2	1.7	3	2.5	0	.0	17	14.2	18	15.0	9	7.5	13	10.8	5	4.2	3	2.5	4	3.3	7	5.8	2	1.7	0	.0	2	1.7	120	100.1
12. Establishing standards for admission	2	.9	19	8.6	1	.4	15	6.8	11	5.0	9	4.1	0	.0	20	9.1	1	.4	29	13.2	18	8.2	21	9.6	16	7.3	31	14.1	19	8.6	4	1.8	2	.9	2	.9	220	99.9
15. Creating new program of study	0	.0	17	6.8	5	2.0	17	6.8	12	4.8	2	.8	1	.4	21	8.4	3	1.2	28	11.2	6	2.4	40	16.1	29	11.6	35	14.1	24	9.6	5	2.0	2	.8	2	.8	249	99.8
TOTALS	9	.7	84	6.9	33	2.7	81	6.6	63	5.2	24	2.0	4	.3	105	8.6	35	2.9	140	11.5	58	4.8	152	12.5	126	10.3	162	13.3	100	8.2	23	1.9	11	.9	10	.8	1220	100.1

Table 11

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Policy Decision Making at Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Policy Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																			
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairmen		Department Chairment		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Establishing requirements for a degree	5	1.3	35	9.4	5	1.3	22	5.9	18	4.8	7	1.9	3	.6	35	9.4	1	.3	45	12.0	21	5.6	39	10.4	36	9.6	54	14.4	39	10.4	6	1.6	3	.8	0	.0	374	99.9
7. Establishing calendar for academic year	6	2.3	25	9.6	10	3.8	14	5.4	7	2.7	6	2.3	0	.0	37	14.2	6	2.3	49	18.8	28	10.8	17	6.5	14	5.4	20	7.7	15	5.8	5	1.9	1	.4	0	.0	260	99.9
9. Meeting staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty	3	2.0	5	3.3	9	6.0	6	4.0	2	1.3	1	.7	0	.0	20	13.2	6	4.0	15	9.9	6	4.0	25	16.6	27	17.9	23	15.2	0	.0	1	.7	1	.7	1	.7	151	100.2
11. Providing or contracting ancilliary services	4	2.1	22	11.3	20	10.3	9	4.6	2	1.0	3	1.5	0	.0	20	10.3	19	9.8	26	14.4	33	17.0	5	2.6	6	3.1	5	2.6	11	5.7	5	2.6	1	.5	1	.5	194	99.9
12. Establishing standards for admission	2	.7	25	9.1	4	1.4	17	6.2	12	4.4	9	3.3	0	.0	25	9.1	3	1.1	43	15.6	37	13.4	21	7.6	23	6.4	34	12.4	16	5.8	4	1.4	0	.0	0	.0	275	99.9
15. Creating new program of study	7	2.2	26	8.0	14	4.3	21	6.5	13	4.0	3	.9	0	.0	30	9.3	6	1.8	43	13.3	11	3.4	31	9.6	34	10.5	45	13.9	27	8.4	9	2.8	3	.9	0	.0	323	99.8
TOTALS	27	1.7	138	8.8	62	3.9	89	5.6	54	3.4	29	1.6	3	.2	167	10.6	41	2.6	223	14.1	136	8.6	138	8.8	140	8.9	181	11.5	108	6.8	30	1.9	9	.6	2	.1	1577	99.9

campus chief administrative officer (12.1%) for decision item 1, establishing requirements for a degree. For decision item 7 concerned with establishing the calendar for the academic year, both large and mid-size colleges' respondents perceived a district-wide committee to be a final decision maker with great frequency. The district academic officer was perceived as a final decision maker for the decision establishing standards for admission, number 12, by the respondents from mid-size colleges.

When the data relative to the participants in policy decision making were summarized by college size, the results were essentially the same as those for all respondents. The four most frequent responses were the faculty, the campus academic officer, the division chairman, and the department chairman. The variations which occurred, again, were those relative to participants for specific decision items.

The large college respondents, Table 9, indicated a local campus committee as a major participant in four of the six decision items. The small college respondents, Table 11, reported a local campus committee as a participant in decision item 1, establishing the requirements for a degree. Also to be noted is the close totals for a number of position incumbents in the small college category. Seven of the 15 position incumbents were indicated as participants for policy decision-making 78% of the time. The remaining 32% of the responses were spread over eight position incumbents and three response categories such as "other."

The final data analysis presented in this subsection is representative of the respondents' perceptions of their level of participation in the decision-making process. The Decision Point Analysis Instrument included a question regarding the respondent's role for each decision item. The possible responses were "make the decision," "approve the decision," "recommend the decision," "help make the decision," "provide information," and "none." Table 12 is a summary of the number of times each choice was selected by role incumbents for policy-type decision items. The percentages indicate the ratio of a particular response category to the total number of responses for that category.

Faculty did not consider themselves to be final decision makers or even active participants in making the decisions. Approximately 82% of their responses were "provide information" and "none." Mid-level administrators perceived themselves to be more active participants in the policy decision-making process even though they did not frequently make or approve decisions. The top administrators perceived themselves to be involved in all ways with a preponderance of responses in the "approve the decision" and "recommend the decision" categories.

Allocative Decisions

Decisions involving the distribution of resources, including personnel-related and financial, within an organization are those termed allocative decisions by Parsons (1960). The decision items included in The Decision Point Analysis Instrument (see Appendix C) relative to allocative decisions were items 2, 6, 8, 10, 16, and 17.

Table 12

Frequencies of Responses Relative to Participants Level of Involvement in Policy Decision Making

Response	RESPONDENTS Top Admin. no.	%	Mid Admin. no.	%	Faculty no.	%
Make Decision	24	7.2	36	4.9	4	.5
Approve Decision	88	26.4	16	2.2	3	.4
Recommend Decision	99	29.7	165	22.5	58	7.1
Help Make Decision	46	13.8	107	14.6	84	10.4
Provide Information	40	12.0	193	26.4	274	33.8
None	36	10.8	215	29.4	387	47.8
Respondent Type Totals	333	99.9	732	100.0	810	100.0

Data collected from all respondents. Table 13 is a summary of the respondents' perceptions of final decision makers for allocative decisions. The position incumbents recognized as final decision makers for this area of decision making were the same as those for policy decisions. However, the order in which they are perceived to be final decision makers changed. For the allocative decision items, the campus chief administrative officer was perceived as the final decision maker 18.6% of the time, followed by the district chief administrative officer (12.9%), the campus academic officer (12.1%) and the board of trustees (8.3%).

Again, as with policy decisions, the final decision makers vary for specific decision items according to the nature of the item. The response to decision item 2, spending funds for audio-visual materials was the campus chief administrative officer, the department chairman, the district business officer, and the division chairman. Also of note for item 2 is the relatively greater response of "other" at the campus level. The identification of this category was most frequently the librarian, the media coordinator, the learning resource center director, and other such titles commonly associated with audio-visual services within an institution.

The spending of budgeted student activity funds, decision item 8, was perceived to be a decision for the campus student affairs officer (26.4% of the time), the campus chief administrative officer (11.7%), and the student (10.7%). The nature of this item would explain the difference in final decision makers from those indicated for overall allocative decisions.

Table 13

Perceptions of All Respondents Relative to Final Decision-Makers in Allocative Decision Making

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																							
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Depart-ment Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	50	5.4	67	7.2	99	10.6	40	4.3	18	1.9	0	.0	13	1.4	130	14.0	58	6.2	86	9.2	9	1.0	97	10.4	113	12.1	71	7.6	21	2.3	1	.1	43	4.6	15	1.6	931	99.9
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	102	10.1	150	15.0	30	3.0	79	7.8	35	3.5	1	.1	6	.6	219	21.7	24	2.4	159	15.8	10	1.0	82	8.1	47	4.7	27	2.7	17	1.7	1	.1	4	.4	14	1.4	1007	100.1
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	35	4.7	48	6.4	35	4.7	12	1.6	8	1.1	88	11.7	1	.1	90	12.0	29	3.9	14	1.9	198	26.4	7	.9	4	.5	11	1.5	40	5.3	80	10.7	15	2.0	36	4.8	751	100.2
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	79	9.1	165	19.1	10	1.2	101	11.7	15	1.7	0	.0	13	1.5	177	20.4	3	.3	136	15.7	5	.6	66	7.6	40	4.6	24	2.8	7	.8	0	.0	4	.5	21	2.4	866	100.0
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	122	12.7	184	19.1	38	4.0	99	10.3	16	1.7	0	.0	8	.8	222	23.1	13	1.4	135	14.0	3	.3	51	5.3	38	4.0	14	1.5	6	.6	0	.0	1	.1	11	1.1	961	100.0
17. Instructional budget request within a department/division	64	6.7	91	9.5	82	8.5	58	6.0	14	1.5	1	.1	2	.2	182	18.9	53	5.5	131	13.6	8	.8	155	12.0	101	10.5	43	4.5	9	.9	0	.0	3	.3	5	.5	962	100.0
TOTALS	452	8.3	705	12.9	294	5.4	389	7.1	106	1.9	90	1.6	43	.8	1020	18.6	180	3.3	661	12.1	233	4.3	418	7.6	343	6.3	190	3.5	100	1.8	82	1.5	70	1.3	102	1.9	5478	100.2

The district academic officer was perceived to be a final decision maker for relocating and reassigning faculty, decision item 10. That position incumbent was included along with three of the final decision makers (i.e., campus chief administrative officer, campus academic officer, and district chief administrative officer) identified by the data from all respondents for this particular decision item.

The same explanation as applied to the response for decision item 8 would apply to the response for decision item 17 which designated the division chairman (12% of the time) and the department chairman (10.5%) as final decision makers after the campus chief administrative officer (18.9%) and the campus academic officer (13.6%) as final decision makers for the instruction budget request within a department or division. The nature of the decision item resulted in the different response.

The second question on the Decision Point Analysis Instrument regarding position incumbent involvement in decision making was relative to those who provide information to the decision maker, those who assist in identifying alternative solutions, or those who help evaluate alternatives. Table 14 is a summary of the respondents' perceptions of position incumbent participation. Again, the specific position incumbents were the same as those for policy decisions but the order is different. The faculty (15.4% of the time) was perceived to be the major participant in allocative decision making. The department chairman (14.1%), the division chairman (12.9%), and the campus academic officer (12%) were other participants for this area of decision making.

Table 14

Perceptions of All Respondents Relative to the Position Incumbents Participating in Allocative Decisions

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																							
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Depart-ment Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	7	1.2	12	2.1	42	7.3	19	3.3	17	3.0	4	.7	3	.5	36	6.3	50	8.7	59	10.3	11	1.9	56	9.7	65	11.3	138	24.0	37	6.4	4	.7	13	2.3	2	.3	575	100.0
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	14	1.9	39	5.4	43	5.9	35	4.8	29	4.0	8	1.1	5	.7	37	5.1	28	3.9	78	10.8	14	1.9	102	14.1	113	15.6	107	14.8	61	8.4	4	.6	5	.7	3	.4	725	100.1
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	4	1.0	13	3.1	17	4.1	10	2.4	8	1.9	13	3.1	1	.2	41	9.9	28	6.6	20	4.8	47	11.4	13	3.1	15	3.6	40	9.7	46	11.1	84	20.3	6	1.5	7	1.7	413	99.7
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	12	2.4	28	5.6	12	2.4	31	6.2	16	3.2	4	.8	7	1.4	58	11.6	7	1.4	79	15.8	8	1.6	82	16.4	82	16.4	55	11.0	9	1.8	2	.4	4	.8	5	.9	501	100.1
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	10	1.5	38	5.9	36	5.9	42	6.5	15	2.3	4	.6	3	.5	48	7.4	22	3.4	104	16.1	7	1.1	113	17.5	106	16.4	63	9.7	25	3.9	2	.3	3	.5	4	.6	647	100.1
17. Instructional budget request within a department/division	5	.9	20	3.5	41	7.1	15	2.6	9	1.6	1	.2	3	.5	38	6.6	41	7.1	74	12.8	7	1.2	77	13.4	102	17.7	125	21.7	12	2.1	2	.3	2	.3	2	.3	576	99.9
TOTALS	52	1.5	150	4.4	193	5.6	152	4.4	94	2.7	34	1.0	22	.6	258	7.5	176	5.1	414	12.0	94	2.7	443	12.9	483	14.1	528	15.4	190	5.5	98	2.9	33	1.0	23	.7	3437	100.0

Decision item 8 relative to the spending of budgeted student activities funds involved a different set of participants than those reported overall. The students were perceived to be participants 20.3% of the time followed by the campus student affairs officer (11.4%), a local campus committee (11.1%), and the campus chief administrative officer (9.9%). The campus student affairs officer and the students were perceived to be active as both final decision makers and as participants for this decision item.

Data reported by college size categories. Tables 15, 16, and 17 illustrate the respondents' perceptions of final decision makers when the data are broken down by college size. For instance, the board of trustees is not frequently perceived as a final decision maker in large colleges. The fourth most frequent position incumbent indicated as a final decision maker in large colleges is the division chairman. Decision item 2, spending funds for audio-visual equipment, was decided by the campus chief administrative officer, the department chairman, the district business officer, and the division chairman in large colleges. The respondents' perceptions of final decision makers for decision items 10 and 16 included the district academic officer as one of the major decision makers. The response for all other decision items matched the response from all respondents (i.e., campus chief administrative officer, district chief administrative officer, campus academic officer, and board of trustees).

The mid-size colleges' respondents perceived the final decision makers to be the same as those in large colleges. The campus chief

Table 15

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Allocative Decisions in Large Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																							
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	17	4.2	20	5.0	43	10.8	15	3.8	6	1.5	0	.0	5	1.2	58	14.5	32	8.0	34	8.5	5	1.2	41	10.2	53	13.2	35	8.8	13	3.2	0	.0	16	4.0	7	1.6	400	99.9
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	36	8.4	51	11.9	16	3.7	37	8.7	22	5.2	0	.0	1	.2	61	19.0	16	3.7	63	14.6	2	.5	39	9.1	25	5.9	16	3.7	11	2.6	1	.2	3	.7	7	1.6	427	99.9
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	13	4.2	11	3.5	15	4.8	2	.6	2	.6	46	14.8	9	.9	36	11.6	15	4.8	3	1.0	78	25.2	4	1.3	3	1.0	4	1.3	22	7.1	34	11.0	6	1.9	16	5.2	310	99.9
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	36	9.3	55	14.2	2	.5	45	11.7	6	1.6	0	.0	10	2.6	77	19.9	0	.0	65	16.8	3	.8	34	6.8	24	6.2	15	5.9	3	.8	0	.0	2	.5	9	2.3	386	99.9
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	37	8.7	71	16.8	22	5.2	46	10.9	8	1.9	0	.0	6	1.4	91	21.5	9	2.1	57	13.5	2	.5	28	6.6	24	5.7	11	2.6	5	1.2	0	.0	0	.0	6	1.4	423	100.0
17. Instructional budget request within a department/division	22	5.5	28	7.0	30	7.5	27	6.8	8	2.0	0	.0	1	.2	75	18.8	25	6.2	60	15.0	3	.8	51	12.8	42	10.5	17	4.2	4	1.0	0	.0	3	.8	4	1.0	400	100.1
TOTALS	161	6.9	236	10.1	128	5.5	172	7.3	52	2.2	46	2.0	23	1.0	418	17.8	97	4.1	262	13.0	93	4.0	197	8.4	171	7.3	96	4.2	58	2.5	35	1.5	30	1.5	49	2.1	2346	100.2

Table 16

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Allocative Decisions in Mid-Size Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	12	4.6	22	8.4	31	11.8	17	6.5	6	2.3	0	.0	7	2.7	32	12.2	12	4.6	27	10.3	1	.4	34	13.0	20	7.6	20	7.6	5	1.9	0	.0	13	5.0	3	1.1	262	100.0
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	33	11.1	42	14.2	6	2.0	30	10.1	4	1.4	1	.3	0	.0	60	20.3	7	2.4	51	17.2	5	1.7	28	9.5	11	3.7	7	2.4	5	1.7	0	.0	1	.3	5	1.7	296	100.0
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	16	6.9	16	6.9	12	5.2	8	3.4	3	1.3	32	13.7	1	.4	23	10.0	10	4.3	5	2.1	51	21.9	2	.8	1	.4	2	.8	10	4.3	23	10.0	6	2.6	12	5.2	233	100.2
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	22	8.8	48	19.1	5	2.0	34	13.5	5	2.0	0	.0	0	.0	49	19.5	1	.4	37	14.7	2	.8	27	10.8	6	2.4	8	3.2	4	1.6	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.2	251	100.0
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	38	14.5	55	21.0	10	3.8	34	13.0	4	1.5	0	.0	0	.0	54	20.6	4	1.5	37	14.1	1	.4	14	5.3	6	2.3	3	1.1	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	2	.8	262	99.9
17. Instructional budget request within a department/division	23	9.1	22	8.7	20	7.9	16	6.3	3	1.2	1	.4	0	.0	41	16.2	17	6.7	31	12.3	1	.4	44	17.4	17	16.7	12	4.7	4	1.6	0	.0	0	.0	1	.4	253	100.0
TOTALS	144	9.2	205	13.2	84	5.4	139	8.9	25	1.6	34	2.2	8	.5	259	16.6	51	3.3	188	12.1	61	3.9	149	9.6	61	3.9	52	3.3	28	1.8	23	1.5	20	1.3	26	1.7	1557	100.0

Table 17

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Allocative Decisions in Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	21	7.8	25	9.3	25	9.3	8	3.0	6	2.2	0	.0	1	.4	40	14.9	14	5.2	25	9.3	5	1.1	22	8.3	40	14.9	16	5.9	3	1.1	1	.4	14	5.2	5	1.8	269	100.0
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	33	11.6	57	20.1	8	2.8	12	4.2	9	3.2	0	.0	5	1.8	78	27.5	1	.4	45	15.8	3	1.1	15	5.3	11	3.9	4	1.4	1	.4	0	.0	0	.0	2	.7	282	100.2
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	6	2.9	21	10.1	8	3.8	2	1.0	3	1.4	10	4.8	0	.0	31	14.9	4	1.9	6	2.9	69	33.2	1	.5	0	.0	5	2.4	8	3.8	23	11.1	3	1.4	8	3.8	208	99.9
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	21	9.2	62	27.1	3	1.3	22	9.6	4	1.7	0	.0	3	1.3	51	22.3	2	.9	34	14.8	0	.0	5	2.2	10	4.4	1	.4	0	.0	0	.0	2	.9	9	3.9	229	100.0
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	47	17.0	58	21.0	6	2.2	19	6.9	4	1.4	0	.0	2	.7	77	27.0	0	.0	41	14.8	0	.0	9	3.3	8	2.9	0	.0	1	.4	0	.0	1	.4	3	1.1	276	100.0
17. Instructional budget request within a department/division	19	6.1	41	13.3	32	10.4	15	4.8	3	1.0	0	.0	1	.3	66	21.4	11	3.6	40	12.9	4	1.3	20	6.5	42	13.6	14	4.5	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	309	100.0
TOTALS	147	9.3	264	16.8	82	5.2	78	5.0	29	1.8	10	.6	12	.8	343	21.8	32	2.0	191	12.1	79	5.0	72	4.6	111	7.0	40	2.5	14	.9	24	1.5	20	1.3	27	1.7	1575	99.9

administrative officer (16.6%) received the greatest frequency of response, followed by the district chief academic officer (13.2%), the campus academic officer (12.1%), and the division chairman (9.6%). Generally, the mid-size college response for specific decision items also parallels that of the large colleges. However, the board of trustees was reported as one of the top four final decision makers for decision items 6 and 16.

The respondents' perceptions for small colleges are the same as the overall perceptions of final decision makers for allocative decision items, the campus chief administrative officer (21.8%), the district chief administrative officer (16.8%), campus academic officer (12.1%), and the board of trustees (9.3%). The analysis of the response to specific decision items is also similar to that for the data collected from all respondents.

The second portion of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument which dealt with the participants in the decision-making process when analyzed by college size yielded the same results as the data from all.

In Tables 18, 19, and 20 it can be noted the faculty, the department chairman, the division chairman, and the campus academic officer were most frequently perceived as participants for allocative decisions in all size categories. These position incumbents are also the same as those perceived as participants for policy decisions.

In large and mid-size categories the campus business officer was frequently reported as a participant for decision item 2 dealing with the expenditure of funds for audio-visual equipment. In the small

Table 18

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Allocative Decision Making at Large Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																				TOTALS	
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	4	1.8	4	1.8	17	7.6	5	2.2	8	3.6	1	.4	2	.9	16	7.2	27	12.1	23	10.3	6	2.7	18	8.1	27	13.1	46	20.6	15	6.7	1	.4	2	.9	1	.4	223	99.8
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	6	2.4	15	5.9	14	5.5	12	4.7	13	5.1	3	1.2	2	.8	16	6.3	15	5.9	22	8.6	5	2.0	34	13.3	39	15.3	37	14.5	19	7.4	2	.8	1	.4	0	.0	255	100.1
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	3	2.0	5	3.4	6	4.1	1	.7	4	2.7	2	1.4	0	.0	13	8.9	17	11.6	9	6.2	12	8.2	6	4.1	7	4.8	14	9.6	11	7.5	27	18.5	4	2.7	5	3.4	146	99.8
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	6	3.0	17	8.6	5	2.5	8	4.1	7	3.6	1	.5	3	1.5	17	8.6	4	2.0	25	12.7	6	3.0	34	17.3	30	15.2	25	12.7	4	2.0	0	.0	3	1.5	2	1.0	197	99.8
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	3	1.3	9	3.9	15	6.4	14	6.0	5	2.2	0	.0	1	.4	15	6.4	11	4.7	36	15.4	3	1.3	42	18.0	40	17.2	24	10.3	10	4.3	1	.4	2	.9	2	.9	233	100.0
17. Instructional budget request within a department/division	4	1.8	9	4.0	21	9.3	4	1.8	4	1.8	0	.0	0	.0	14	6.2	22	9.7	24	10.6	1	.4	29	12.8	42	18.6	44	19.5	5	2.2	1	.4	1	.4	1	.4	226	99.5
TOTALS	26	2.0	59	4.6	78	6.1	44	3.4	41	3.2	7	.6	8	.6	91	7.1	96	7.5	139	10.9	33	2.6	163	12.7	185	14.4	190	14.8	64	5.0	32	2.5	13	1.0	11	.9	1280	99.9

Table 19

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Position Incumbents Participating in Allocative Decisions in Mid-Size Community Colleges

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																							
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	2	1.2	3	1.8	9	5.4	9	5.4	5	4.0	1	.6	1	.6	7	4.2	12	7.1	12	7.1	2	1.2	22	13.1	22	13.1	45	26.8	11	6.5	1	.6	3	1.8	1	.6	168	100.1
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	1	.5	5	2.6	9	4.7	9	4.7	8	4.2	1	.5	0	.0	8	4.2	4	2.1	21	10.9	1	.5	30	15.6	30	15.6	34	17.7	18	9.4	0	.0	1	.5	3	1.6	192	100.0
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	0	.0	5	4.6	2	1.8	2	1.8	3	2.8	5	4.6	1	.9	10	9.2	3	2.8	2	1.8	19	17.4	5	4.6	5	4.6	9	8.2	15	13.8	24	22.0	0	.0	1	.9	109	100.0
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	2	1.2	7	4.3	2	1.2	13	8.0	6	3.7	1	.6	3	1.8	20	12.3	3	1.8	25	15.4	0	.0	25	15.4	25	15.4	19	11.7	4	2.5	0	.0	1	.6	2	1.2	162	99.6
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	3	1.5	10	5.1	11	5.6	15	7.7	6	3.1	3	1.5	1	.5	14	7.2	5	2.6	30	15.4	2	1.0	28	14.4	28	14.4	18	9.2	7	3.6	0	.0	0	.0	1	.5	195	99.9
17. Instructional budget request within a department/ division	0	.0	5	2.8	10	5.8	7	3.9	2	1.1	0	.0	1	.6	10	5.6	12	6.7	23	12.8	1	.6	37	20.7	37	20.7	36	20.1	6	3.4	0	.0	0	.0	1	.6	179	100.1
TOTALS	8	.8	35	3.5	43	4.3	55	5.5	30	3.0	11	1.1	7	.7	89	8.9	39	3.9	113	11.2	25	2.5	147	14.6	147	14.6	161	16.0	61	6.1	25	2.5	5	.5	9	.9	1005	100.1

Table 20

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Allocative Decision Making in Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Allocative Decision Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Depart-ment Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2. Spending funds for audio-visual equipment	1	.5	5	2.7	16	8.7	5	2.7	4	2.2	2	1.1	0	.0	13	7.1	11	6.0	24	13.0	3	1.6	16	8.7	16	18.7	47	25.5	11	6.0	2	1.1	8	4.4	0	.0	184	100.0
6. Allocating resources for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program	7	2.5	19	6.8	20	7.2	14	5.0	8	2.9	4	1.4	3	1.1	13	4.7	9	3.2	35	12.6	8	2.9	29	10.4	44	15.8	36	13.0	24	8.6	2	.7	3	1.1	0	.0	278	99.9
8. Spending budgeted student activity funds	1	.6	3	1.9	9	5.7	7	4.4	1	.6	6	3.8	0	.0	18	11.4	8	5.1	9	5.7	16	10.1	4	2.5	3	1.9	17	10.8	20	12.7	33	20.9	2	1.3	1	.6	156	100.0
10. Relocating or reassigning faculty	4	2.8	4	2.8	5	3.5	10	7.0	3	2.1	2	1.4	1	.7	21	14.8	0	.0	29	20.4	2	1.4	19	13.4	27	19.0	11	7.8	1	.7	2	1.4	0	.0	1	.7	142	99.9
16. Allocating new faculty positions to an instructional unit	4	1.8	19	8.7	12	5.5	13	5.9	4	1.8	1	.5	1	.5	19	8.6	6	2.7	38	17.4	2	.9	30	13.7	38	17.4	21	9.6	8	3.6	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	219	100.1
17. Instructional budget request within a department/ division	1	.6	6	3.5	10	5.8	4	2.3	3	1.8	1	.6	2	1.2	14	8.2	7	4.1	27	15.8	5	2.9	20	11.7	23	13.4	45	26.3	1	.6	1	.6	1	.6	0	.0	171	100.0
TOTALS	18	1.6	56	4.9	72	6.2	53	4.6	23	2.0	16	1.4	7	.6	98	8.5	41	3.6	162	14.1	36	3.1	118	10.2	151	13.1	177	15.4	65	5.6	41	3.6	15	1.3	3	.3	1152	100.1

category, the district business officer was reported as a major participant for the same decision item.

The response to decision 8, spending budgeted student activity funds, varied slightly from the all respondent data. In both mid-size and small colleges the local campus committee was chosen as a participant with great frequency which parallels the all respondent data for that item. However, the respondents from large colleges did not perceive the local campus committee to be a major participant for that particular item.

The respondents' perceptions of their own involvement in the allocative decision-making process is the subject of Table 21. The chief administrative officers at both the district-level and campus-level (top administrators) perceived themselves to be very active participants in the decision-making process with the majority reporting themselves as either "making," "approving," or "recommending" the decision. The faculty, on the other hand, do not see themselves as responsible for allocative decision making. Approximately 80% of their responses fell into the "provide information" or "none" categories. Although mid-level administrators did not frequently perceive themselves as making or approving decisions, their perceptions of their involvement was fairly evenly distributed throughout the other four possible response categories.

Coordination Decisions

Parsons (1960) defined coordination decisions as those which directly affect or promote the cooperation of personnel within the organization. Items numbered 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, and 18 on the Decision Point Analysis Instrument represent the coordination type of decision.

Table 21

Frequencies of Responses Relative to Participants' Level of Allocative Decision-Making Involvement

Response	RESPONDENTS Top Admin. No.	%	Mid Admin. No.	%	Faculty No.	%
Make Decision	50	15.2	26	3.5	10	1.2
Approve Decision	212	36.8	39	5.3	4	.5
Recommend Decision	69	21.0	211	28.8	72	9.0
Help Make Decision	31	9.4	100	13.6	80	10.0
Provide Information	15	4.6	187	25.5	287	35.5
None	43	13.1	170	23.2	355	43.9
Respondent Type Totals	329	100.1	733	99.9	808	100.1

Data collected from all respondents. The position incumbents perceived by all respondents as final decision makers for coordination decisions are reported in Table 22. As with policy-type decisions and with allocative-type decisions, the four most frequently chosen position incumbents are the campus chief administrative officer (18.9% of the time), the district chief administrative officer (15.8%), the campus academic officer (13.9%), and the board of trustees (12.4%). When the data for the individual decision items are analyzed, only a few exceptions to the overall perceptions can be noted.

The response to decision item 3 which concerns the specific teaching assignment for individual faculty members indicated the division chairman, the department chairman, and the faculty as final decision makers. This is the only coordination decision item for which faculty is indicated as a decision maker with any frequency.

Another item which has a response varying from the overall response is decision item 13 relative to the awarding of tenure or continuing contract to a faculty member. For this particular item the board of trustees was perceived as the final decision maker 22.6% of the time. The campus chief administrative officer was perceived as final decision maker 19.1% of the time and the district chief administrative officer 18.6%. The final position incumbent to be noted as a decision maker for this item is the campus business officer with 11.9% response rate.

The position incumbent frequently chosen as a final decision maker for decision item 14, implementing board policy in evaluating instruction

Table 22

Perceptions of All Respondents Relative to the Position Incumbents Involved in Making Coordination Decisions

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	35	4.7	44	5.9	5	.7	55	7.4	12	1.6	1	.1	13	1.7	72	9.7	1	.1	158	21.2	3	.4	134	18.0	124	16.6	70	9.4	3	.4	1	.1	11	1.5	2	.3	744	99.6
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	135	14.9	144	15.9	4	.4	57	6.3	11	1.2	0	.0	6	.7	194	21.4	0	.0	141	15.5	3	.3	93	10.2	66	77.3	18	2.0	13	1.4	0	.0	6	.7	17	1.9	908	100.1
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	146	16.6	136	15.5	4	.5	57	6.5	60	6.8	1	.1	9	1.0	189	21.5	1	.1	118	13.4	4	.5	53	6.0	31	3.5	14	1.6	46	5.2	0	.0	5	.6	6	.7	880	100.1
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	180	22.6	148	18.6	6	.8	55	6.9	15	1.9	1	.1	11	1.4	153	19.2	95	11.9	31	5.9	33	4.1	5	.6	3	.4	4	.5	8	1.0	5	.6	3	.4	40	5.0	796	100.8
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	79	8.5	156	16.8	5	.5	104	11.2	35	3.8	0	.0	2	.2	161	17.3	2	.2	163	17.6	5	.5	81	8.7	49	5.3	31	3.3	24	2.6	2	.2	6	.6	23	2.5	928	99.8
18. Involving faculty in decision making process	81	7.9	205	19.9	9	.9	78	7.6	35	3.4	5	.5	5	.5	229	22.3	9	.9	126	12.3	22	2.1	78	7.6	64	6.2	33	3.2	26	2.5	1	.1	5	.5	17	1.7	1028	100.1
TOTALS	656	12.4	833	15.8	33	.6	406	7.7	168	3.2	8	.2	46	.8	998	18.9	110	2.1	737	15.9	70	1.3	444	8.4	337	6.4	170	3.2	120	2.3	9	.2	36	.7	105	2.0	5286	100.2

in a specific course or program, is the district academic officer (11.2% of the time). This position follows the campus academic officer (17.6%), the campus chief administrative officer (17.3%), and the district chief administrative officer (16.8%).

Data pertaining to the participants in coordination decision making are summarized in Table 23. Those position incumbents most frequently perceived as participants for coordination-type decisions were the department chairman (17% of the time), the campus academic officer (15.6%), the division chairman (15%), and the faculty (13.2%). To be noted from the data reported for this type of decision is the faculty's lesser involvement in this type versus the two previously reported types. The data for policy decisions and for allocative decisions indicate a perception of faculty as the most frequent participant in decision making while the data in Table 23 for coordination decisions indicate faculty as the fourth most frequent participant.

There is no discussion of respondents' perception of participants for individual decision items as there is no variation to be noted. For this particular category of decisions the position incumbents perceived as participants are consistent for all items.

Data reported by college size categories. As with the policy-type and allocative-type decisions, the data for coordination decisions are reported by college size category. The perceived final decision makers (see Tables 24, 25, and 26) when compared by college size category, vary somewhat. The four most frequently perceived final decision makers for coordination decisions in large and small colleges are the

Table 23

Perceptions of All Respondents Relative to the Position Incumbents Participating in Making Coordination Decisions

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Depart-ment Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	11	2.5	13	2.9	4	.9	9	2.0	9	2.0	2	.5	3	.7	38	8.6	1	.2	46	10.4	4	.9	55	12.4	82	18.6	150	33.9	9	2.0	0	.0	2	.5	4	.9	442	99.9
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	13	2.5	41	8.0	3	.6	37	7.2	7	1.4	0	.0	7	1.4	41	8.0	1	.2	84	16.3	6	1.2	84	16.3	98	19.1	41	8.0	25	4.9	16	3.1	5	1.0	5	1.0	514	100.2
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for education or skill upgrading purposes	12	2.1	39	6.7	8	1.5	32	5.5	28	4.8	2	.3	4	.7	50	8.6	7	1.2	100	17.2	3	.5	98	16.9	106	18.3	45	7.8	36	6.2	0	.0	4	.7	6	1.0	580	100.0
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	10	1.8	49	8.8	11	2.0	43	7.7	11	2.0	3	.5	7	1.3	58	10.4	5	.9	96	17.3	8	1.4	68	15.8	68	15.8	38	6.8	20	3.6	12	2.2	3	.5	6	1.1	556	99.9
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	8	1.5	23	4.3	5	.9	31	5.8	32	6.0	4	.8	5	.9	45	8.4	1	.2	74	13.9	9	1.7	75	14.1	90	16.9	78	14.6	38	7.1	8	1.5	4	.8	3	.6	533	100.0
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	10	2.4	14	3.4	11	2.6	27	6.5	20	4.8	5	1.2	0	.0	26	6.2	11	2.6	74	17.7	18	4.3	56	13.4	52	12.5	51	12.2	32	7.7	4	1.0	3	.7	3	.7	417	99.9
TOTALS	64	2.1	179	5.9	42	1.4	179	5.9	107	3.5	16	.5	26	.9	258	8.5	26	.9	474	15.6	48	1.6	456	15.0	516	17.0	403	13.2	160	5.3	40	1.3	21	.7	27	.9	3042	100.2

Table 24

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Coordination Decisions in Large Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																							
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Depart-ment Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	17	5.9	15	5.2	3	1.0	16	5.5	4	1.4	0	.0	3	1.0	14	4.8	0	.0	52	18.0	0	.0	51	17.6	61	21.1	40	13.8	1	.3	1	.3	9	3.1	2	.7	289	99.7
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	50	13.7	44	12.1	1	.3	27	7.4	5	1.4	0	.0	4	1.1	63	17.3	0	.0	53	14.5	1	.3	44	12.1	42	11.5	11	3.0	6	1.6	0	.0	5	1.4	9	2.5	365	100.2
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	56	15.2	38	10.6	3	.8	26	7.1	43	11.7	0	.0	6	1.6	64	17.4	0	.0	46	12.5	2	.5	24	6.5	19	5.2	8	2.2	27	7.3	0	.0	3	.8	2	.5	368	99.9
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	71	17.8	53	13.2	4	1.0	22	5.5	5	1.2	0	.0	9	2.2	78	19.5	0	.0	57	14.2	3	.6	33	8.2	35	8.8	15	3.8	9	2.2	0	.0	3	.8	3	.8	400	100.0
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	31	8.5	57	15.6	1	.3	39	10.6	14	3.8	0	.0	1	.3	55	15.0	0	.0	60	16.4	2	.5	38	10.4	23	6.3	16	4.4	14	3.8	0	.0	4	1.1	11	3.0	366	100.0
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	41	10.0	75	18.2	4	1.0	25	6.1	16	4.0	2	.5	4	1.0	87	21.2	3	.7	46	11.2	8	1.9	29	7.1	27	6.6	20	4.8	12	2.9	1	.2	4	1.0	7	1.7	411	100.2
TOTALS	266	12.1	283	12.9	16	.7	155	7.0	87	4.0	2	.1	27	1.2	361	16.4	3	.1	314	14.3	16	.7	219	10.0	207	9.4	110	5.0	69	3.1	2	.1	28	1.5	34	1.5	2199	99.9

Table 25

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Coordination Decisions in Mid-Size Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	10	4.4	10	4.4	2	.9	27	12.0	6	2.7	1	.4	6	2.7	20	8.9	1	.4	40	17.8	1	.4	54	24.0	26	11.6	17	7.6	2	.9	0	.0	2	.9	0	.0	225	100.0
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	37	13.8	39	14.6	1	.4	23	8.6	3	1.1	0	.0	1	.4	50	18.7	0	.0	46	17.2	0	.0	35	13.1	15	5.6	6	2.2	6	2.2	0	.0	0	.0	6	2.2	268	100.1
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	42	16.7	43	17.1	1	.4	26	10.3	13	5.2	1	.4	2	.8	47	18.7	1	.4	32	12.7	2	.8	21	8.3	3	1.2	3	1.2	13	5.2	0	.0	1	.4	1	.4	252	100.2
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	59	20.7	46	16.1	2	.7	25	8.8	8	2.8	1	.4	1	.4	51	17.8	0	.0	36	12.6	1	.4	24	8.4	11	3.8	4	1.4	11	3.8	1	.4	1	.4	3	1.1	285	100.0
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	20	7.6	40	15.2	1	.4	34	12.9	13	4.9	0	.0	1	.4	40	15.2	2	.8	44	16.7	0	.0	30	11.4	10	3.8	9	3.4	6	2.3	1	.4	2	.8	10	3.8	263	100.0
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	21	6.6	61	19.2	2	.6	29	9.1	11	3.5	1	.3	1	.3	62	19.6	4	1.3	38	12.0	6	1.9	36	11.4	20	6.3	6	1.9	12	3.8	0	.0	1	.3	6	1.9	317	100.0
TOTALS	189	11.7	239	14.8	9	.6	164	10.2	54	3.4	4	.2	12	.7	270	16.8	8	.5	236	14.6	10	.6	200	12.4	85	5.3	45	2.8	50	3.1	2	.1	7	.4	26	1.6	1610	99.8

Table 26

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to the Final Decision Makers for Coordination Decisions in Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																		TOTALS	
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Depart-ment Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	8	3.5	19	8.3	0	.0	12	5.2	2	.9	0	.0	4	1.7	38	16.5	0	.0	66	28.7	2	.9	29	12.6	37	16.1	13	5.6	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	230	100.0
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	46	17.4	61	22.2	2	.7	7	2.5	3	1.1	0	.0	1	.4	81	29.4	0	.0	42	15.3	2	.7	14	5.1	9	3.3	1	.4	1	.4	0	.0	1	.4	2	.7	275	100.0
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	48	18.5	54	20.8	0	.0	5	1.9	4	1.5	0	.0	1	.4	78	30.0	0	.0	40	15.4	0	.0	8	3.1	9	3.5	3	1.2	6	2.3	0	.0	1	.4	3	1.2	260	100.2
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	50	21.1	49	20.7	0	.0	8	3.4	2	.8	0	.0	1	.4	62	26.2	0	.0	40	16.9	0	.0	12	5.1	9	3.8	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	.4	3	1.3	237	100.1
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a particular course or program	28	9.4	59	19.7	3	1.0	31	10.4	8	2.7	0	.0	0	.0	66	22.1	0	.0	59	19.7	3	1.0	13	4.3	16	5.4	6	2.0	4	1.3	1	.3	0	.0	2	.7	299	100.0
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	19	6.3	69	23.0	3	1.0	24	8.0	8	2.7	2	.7	0	.0	80	26.7	2	.7	42	14.0	8	2.7	13	4.3	17	5.7	7	2.3	2	.7	0	.0	0	.0	4	1.3	300	100.1
TOTALS	201	12.6	311	19.4	8	.5	87	5.4	27	1.7	2	.1	7	.4	405	25.3	2	.1	289	18.0	15	.9	89	5.6	97	6.0	30	1.8	13	.8	1	.06	3	.2	14	.9	1601	99.9

same as those reported in the overall respondent data, the campus chief administrative officer, the district chief administrative officer, the campus academic officer, and the board of trustees. In mid-size colleges, however, the board of trustees is replaced by the division chairman as one of the top four final decision makers. There are also variations when specific items are analyzed.

For decision item 3 relative to a specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member, the perceived final decision makers included the division chairman and department chairman in all size categories and the faculty in large colleges. Another item for which a variation can be observed is number 5, a decision to award an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes. In large colleges a district-wide committee was frequently chosen as a final decision maker for this item. The other specific decision item variations did not differ from those discussed in the presentation of the data collected from all respondents.

The perceived participants for coordination-type decisions when reported by college size category (see Tables 27, 28, and 29) are the same as those reported in data from all respondents. They are the campus academic officer, the division chairman, the department chairman, and the faculty. These are also the same participants in decision making as reported for policy and allocative decisions. Very few differences were noted when the specific size category data were analyzed, but there were instances of variation to be pointed out.

Table 27

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Coordination Decision Making in Large Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																					
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	5	3.4	5	3.4	1	.7	1	.7	2	1.3	0	.0	2	1.3	14	9.4	1	.7	22	14.8	0	.0	20	13.4	24	16.1	48	32.2	1	.7	0	.0	1	.7	2	1.3	149	100.1
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	6	5.4	15	8.6	1	.6	16	9.2	0	.0	0	.0	4	2.3	16	2.3	0	.0	31	17.8	2	1.2	26	14.9	28	16.1	14	8.1	6	3.4	5	2.9	3	1.7	1	.6	174	100.0
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	7	3.4	16	7.8	5	1.5	9	4.4	12	5.8	0	.0	2	1.0	18	8.7	4	1.9	34	16.5	2	1.0	35	17.0	34	16.5	13	6.5	12	5.8	0	.0	3	1.5	2	1.0	206	100.1
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	5	2.6	19	9.7	3	1.5	16	8.2	0	.0	0	.0	5	2.6	21	10.7	1	.5	34	17.4	3	1.5	31	15.8	31	15.8	16	8.2	3	1.5	4	2.0	2	1.0	2	1.0	196	100.0
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	2	1.0	5	2.6	2	1.0	8	4.2	13	6.7	1	.5	4	2.1	18	9.3	1	.5	25	13.0	2	1.0	29	15.0	32	16.6	28	14.5	15	7.8	4	2.1	3	1.6	1	.5	193	100.0
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	4	2.6	7	4.5	5	3.2	9	5.8	9	5.8	0	.0	0	.0	12	7.7	12	7.7	8	5.1	23	14.7	8	5.1	23	14.7	15	9.6	17	10.9	14	9.0	0	.0	1	.6	156	99.9
TOTALS	29	2.7	67	6.2	15	1.4	59	5.5	36	3.4	1	.1	17	1.6	99	9.2	99	9.2	15	1.4	169	15.7	17	1.6	164	15.3	164	15.5	136	12.7	51	4.8	13	1.2	13	1.2	1074	100.1

Table 28

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Coordination Decision Making in Mid-Size Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Coordination Decisions Relative To:	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																			
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	2	1.4	6	4.2	1	.7	4	2.8	5	3.5	1	.7	1	.7	8	5.6	0	.0	15	10.4	2	1.4	17	11.8	28	19.4	46	31.9	5	3.5	0	.0	1	.7	2	1.4	144	100.1
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	3	1.8	12	7.1	1	.6	10	5.9	5	2.9	0	.0	1	.6	13	7.6	1	.6	17	10.0	1	.6	33	19.4	29	7.1	20	11.8	13	7.6	6	3.5	2	1.2	3	1.8	170	100.1
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	3	1.6	9	4.9	2	1.1	11	6.0	12	6.6	1	.5	1	.5	17	9.3	1	.5	28	15.3	0	.0	38	20.8	31	16.9	11	6.0	15	8.2	0	.0	1	.5	2	1.1	183	99.8
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	0	.0	15	7.4	2	1.0	15	7.4	9	4.4	0	.0	1	.5	19	9.4	2	1.0	29	14.3	2	1.0	37	18.2	26	13.8	19	9.4	15	7.4	7	3.4	1	.5	2	1.0	205	100.1
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	0	.0	4	2.6	1	.6	13	8.6	12	7.9	0	.0	0	.0	9	5.9	0	.0	23	15.1	3	2.0	24	15.8	27	17.8	20	13.2	13	8.6	1	.6	0	.0	2	1.3	152	100.0
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	3	3.0	3	3.0	3	3.0	11	11.0	6	6.0	1	1.0	0	.0	5	5.0	2	2.0	23	23.0	2	2.0	12	12.0	9	9.0	10	10.0	5	5.0	2	2.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	100	100.0
TOTALS	11	1.2	49	5.1	10	1.1	64	6.7	49	5.1	3	.3	4	.4	71	7.4	6	.6	135	14.2	10	1.1	161	16.9	152	16.0	126	13.2	66	6.9	16	1.7	6	.6	13	1.4	952	99.9

Table 29

Perceptions of Respondents Relative to Participants in Coordination Decision Making in Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Coordination Decisions Relative To	DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL														CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL																				TOTALS	
	Board of Trustees		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		District Wide Committee		Student Affairs Officer		Other		Chief Admin. Officer		Business Officer		Academic Officer		Student Affairs Officer		Division Chairman		Department Chairman		Faculty		Local Campus Committee		Student		Other		Don't Know			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member	4	2.7	2	1.5	2	1.3	4	2.7	2	1.5	1	.7	0	.0	16	10.7	0	.0	9	6.0	2	1.3	18	12.1	30	20.1	56	37.6	3	2.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	149	99.8
4. Dismissing a non-tenured faculty member	4	2.4	14	8.2	1	.6	11	6.5	2	1.2	0	.0	2	1.2	12	7.1	0	.0	36	21.2	3	1.8	25	14.7	41	24.1	7	4.1	6	3.5	5	2.9	0	.0	1	.6	170	100.1
5. Awarding an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes	2	1.1	14	7.3	3	1.6	12	6.3	4	2.1	1	.5	1	.5	15	7.9	2	1.1	38	19.9	1	.5	25	15.1	41	21.5	21	11.0	9	4.7	0	.0	0	.0	2	1.1	191	100.2
13. Awarding tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member	5	3.2	15	9.8	6	3.8	12	7.6	2	1.3	3	1.8	1	.6	18	11.5	2	1.3	33	21.0	3	1.9	20	12.7	29	18.5	3	1.9	2	1.3	1	.6	0	.0	2	1.5	157	100.0
14. Implementing board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program	6	3.2	14	7.4	2	1.1	10	5.3	7	3.7	3	1.6	1	.5	18	9.6	0	.0	26	13.8	4	2.1	22	11.7	31	16.5	30	16.0	10	5.3	3	1.6	1	.5	0	.0	188	99.8
18. Involving faculty in the decision making process	3	1.9	4	2.5	3	1.9	7	4.4	5	5.1	4	2.5	0	.0	9	5.6	1	.6	28	17.4	8	5.0	21	13.0	28	17.4	24	14.9	13	8.1	2	1.2	1	.6	0	.0	161	100.1
TOTALS	24	2.4	63	6.2	17	1.7	56	5.5	22	2.2	12	1.2	5	.5	88	8.7	5	.5	170	16.7	21	2.1	131	13.0	200	20.0	141	13.9	43	4.2	11	1.1	2	.2	5	.5	1016	100.6

In the large colleges the respondents perceived the campus chief administrative officer as a final decision maker for decision items 4 and 5, and the district chief administrative officer as a final decision maker for decision items 5 and 13. Since these items relate to tenure, leave, and dismissal of a faculty member, it is understandable why the respondents would indicate these particular position incumbents as participants.

The data from mid-size colleges did not show sufficient variation to be discussed, but of note in the small college category is the greater frequency with which the department chairman is perceived as a participant for each decision item over the division chairman. This is noted since, for the most part, the small colleges for all decision types reported the department chairman with greater frequency than the division chairman. A possible explanation is that due to their size these colleges may not have an organizational structure which includes all the position incumbents listed on the Decision Point Analysis Instrument. The respondents from small colleges also perceived the district chief administrative officer as a participant for decision item 4 and the campus chief administrative officer as a participant for decision item 13.

The participants' perceptions of their own involvement in coordination decisions are summarized in Table 30. As with the other types of decisions, top administrators perceived themselves as most frequently making, approving, or recommending the decisions. Approximately three-quarters of their responses for coordination

Table 30

Frequencies of Responses Relative to Participants' Level of Involvement in Coordination Decision-Making

Response	RESPONDENTS Top Admin. No.	%	Mid Admin. No.	%	Faculty No.	%
Make Decision	53	16.0	72	9.6	8	1.0
Approve Decision	95	28.7	33	4.4	9	1.1
Recommend Decision	92	27.8	224	30.0	45	5.7
Help Make Decision	36	10.9	123	16.5	83	10.5
Provide Information	11	3.3	147	19.7	249	31.6
None	44	13.3	148	19.8	393	50.0
Respondent Type Totals	331	100.0	747	100.0	787	99.9

decisions fell into those categories. The faculty, as found with policy and allocative decisions, perceived themselves as information providers or not involved at all. The great majority of their responses (81.6%) fell into these two categories. The mid-level administrators perceived themselves to be involved in all ways with the "recommend decision" category receiving the greatest response (30%). However, the three categories following the recommended one received the majority of responses from mid-level administrators (56%).

A Comparison of Position INcumbent Involvement in the Decision-Making Process of Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Data presented and analyzed in this section are intended to provide an answer to the third problem question regarding the relationship between the size of the institution and the position incumbents involved in specific areas of decision making. The answer is presented in two ways, the involvement of position incumbents as final decision makers for each decision type (i.e., policy, allocative, and coordination) and the involvement of position incumbents as participants.

As a first step in the process of data analysis in order to answer this question the frequency data were inspected for individual schools by respondent category (i.e., top-level administrator, mid-level administrator, and faculty). The result of this inspection was that the response of faculty was not included for purposes of the analysis of variance as it was not consistent with the responses of the other two groups of respondents in a majority of colleges (15 of the 27 reporting). The decision to eliminate the faculty response was based

on a belief that the administrators who are responsible for the making and implementation of decisions are more knowledgeable of the process and position incumbents involved in those processes. The inspection of the data substantiated this belief.

Since the Decision Point Analysis Instrument allowed for a multiple response, it was necessary to develop a system for determining a score for each position incumbent in order that a mean could be determined. In order to achieve this end a score of one was assigned to each position incumbent who was perceived as a final decision maker (or participant) by 60% or more of those respondents within a school for a particular decision item. The scores for all the decision items representing a decision type were summed to obtain a college total for that decision type. The college totals of the colleges within a particular size category were summed and divided by nine (the number of schools within a size group) to arrive at a mean for the size category.

These means and the standard deviations based on them appear in the tables constructed to assist in summarizing and analyzing the data. Tables 31, 33, and 35 represent the average number of times each position incumbent was perceived as the final decision maker for policy, allocative, and coordination decisions; and Tables 32, 34, and 36 represent the average number of times each was perceived as a participant (including final decision maker). In order to determine a significant difference of importance, a series of analysis of variance tests was computed with a .05 level of significance required.

Table 31

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance Results Relative to Positions of Perceived Final Decision Makers for Policy Decisions in Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

	POSITION INCUMBENTS																	
	DISTRICT/CENTRAL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE										
Statistic	Board of Trustees	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District Wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Department Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other	Don't Know
LARGE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	6.56	5.11	1.89	2.89	2.33	.11	1.11	5.44	.89	6.22	1.33	3.44	3.56	4.11	2.77	.33	0.00	0.00
SD	4.13	2.98	.93	3.18	1.94	.33	1.60	3.00	1.17	1.64	1.87	3.09	2.18	2.15	2.49	1.00	0.00	0.00
MID SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	4.00	4.33	1.11	2.89	2.44	.22	0.00	5.33	.78	6.22	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.33	2.33	.11	.44	.11
SD	2.30	2.64	1.27	2.26	2.56	.44	0.00	3.64	1.09	3.80	2.06	2.78	2.00	3.16	1.87	.33	1.33	.33
SMALL SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	6.22	7.22	1.44	3.89	2.11	.67	.11	9.00	.89	8.33	3.22	3.11	3.56	3.56	1.33	.33	0.00	0.00
SD	2.49	2.64	1.42	3.22	2.42	1.00	.33	2.87	.78	2.69	2.59	2.57	3.17	2.35	1.58	.71	0.00	0.00
COMPUTED F	1.80	2.64	.91	.35	.05	1.79	2.41	3.85	.04	1.64	1.72	.23	1.16	.22	1.21	.28	1.00	1.00
PROBABILITY OF GREATER CRITICAL F	.1871	.0916	.4146	.7070	.9530	.1890	.1109	.0355	.9656	.2141	.2012	.7979	.3316	.8079	.3152	.7613	.3827	.3827

Table 32

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance Results Relative to Positions of Perceived Participants (Including Final Decision Makers) for Policy Decisions in Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

	POSITION INCUMBENTS																
	DISTRICT/CENTRAL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE									
Statistic	Board of Trustees	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District Wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Department Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other	Don't Know
LARGE SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	6.56	3.67	1.11	1.78	1.22	0.00	.44	3.22	.33	2.78	.33	1.11	.67	.22	.22	0.00	0.00	0.00
SD	4.13	2.29	.76	1.72	1.39	0.00	.73	3.27	.71	2.05	.50	1.17	1.00	.44	.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
MID SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	3.89	3.76	.89	2.11	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.89	.22	3.00	.22	1.00	.33	.22	.33	0.00	.22	0.00
SD	2.20	2.73	1.17	1.76	2.06	0.00	0.00	2.32	.44	1.87	.44	1.12	.71	.44	.50	0.00	.67	0.00
SMALL SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	5.89	5.00	1.00	2.78	1.11	.56	.11	4.44	.44	2.67	.22	.33	.67	.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SD	2.26	1.87	1.00	2.28	1.54	1.01	.33	2.50	.53	1.22	.44	.71	1.32	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMPUTED F	1.92	.91	.11	.62	.74	2.70	2.26	.81	.34	.06	.17	1.54	.31	.70	1.12	NA	1.00	NA
PROBABILITY OF GREATER CRITICAL F	.1676	.4150	.8944	.5452	.4676	.0874	.1260	.4562	.7132	.9192	.8414	.2357	.7380	.5036	.3427	NA	.3827	NA

Table 33

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance Results Relative to Positions of Perceived Final Decision Makers for Allocative Decisions in Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community College Positions

	POSITION INCUMBENTS																
	DISTRICT/CENTRAL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE									
Statistic	Board of Trustees	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District Wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Department Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other	Don't Know
LARGE SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	.67	2.33	.78	1.22	.33	.33	.33	5.89	.56	3.67	1.11	1.89	.56	.33	.22	.11	.22	0.00
SD	1.12	2.12	1.09	1.86	.71	.71	.71	3.06	1.13	3.00	.93	1.83	.73	.71	.44	.33	.44	0.00
MID SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	1.22	2.56	.67	1.11	.22	.11	0.00	4.33	.44	2.78	.89	1.22	.11	.22	.33	.44	.44	0.00
SD	1.39	2.35	1.12	1.54	.67	.33	0.00	3.04	1.01	2.82	1.17	2.05	.33	.44	.71	.73	.73	0.00
SMALL SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	1.33	3.89	1.11	1.33	.22	.11	.11	5.44	0.00	2.44	1.33	1.00	1.22	.22	0.00	.33	0.00	0.00
SD	1.73	2.89	.93	1.50	.67	.33	.33	2.70	0.00	1.81	.87	1.66	1.30	.44	0.00	.44	0.00	0.00
COMPUTER F	.56	1.04	.44	.04	.08	.62	1.27	.67	1.01	.53	.45	.56	3.62	.1250	1.12	.93	1.85	NA
PROBABILITY OF GREATER CRITICAL F	.5807	.3691	.6510	.9595	.9234	.5487	.2983	.5213	.3785	.5936	.6438	.5781	.0423	.8831	.3427	.4071	.1796	NA

Table 34

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance Results Relative to Positions of Perceived Participants (Including Final Decision Makers) for Allocative Decisions in Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

Statistic	POSITION INCUMBENTS: DISTRICT/CENTRAL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE										
	Board of Trustees	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District Wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Department Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other	Don't Know
LARGE SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	1.00	3.88	1.62	2.00	.50	.38	.38	9.25	2.00	8.00	2.12	5.50	5.12	3.50	1.00	1.25	.25	0.00
SD	1.41	1.88	1.60	2.78	.76	.74	.74	2.12	2.88	2.83	.99	4.57	3.44	3.50	1.60	.89	.46	0.00
MID SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	1.10	2.90	1.20	2.00	.50	.30	0.00	5.10	.70	5.50	1.30	4.40	2.70	2.50	1.20	.80	.70	.10
SD	1.37	2.28	1.62	1.94	1.27	.67	0.00	3.90	1.34	3.41	1.06	3.40	3.09	2.54	1.62	.92	1.25	.32
SMALL SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	1.89	5.33	2.78	2.67	.78	.22	.11	8.11	.56	7.56	1.67	3.44	3.89	3.56	.78	1.11	.22	0.00
SD	1.90	2.55	2.54	2.83	1.09	.44	.33	2.57	1.33	2.24	.71	3.32	3.41	2.13	.83	.76	.44	0.00
COMPUTED F	.84	2.74	1.60	.21	.20	.12	1.62	4.59	1.44	1.98	1.73	.63	1.20	.44	.21	.65	.95	.84
PROBABILITY OF GREATER CRITICAL F	.4419	.0850	.2234	.8116	.8217	.8833	.2186	.0205	.2554	.1599	.1986	.5390	.3183	.6467	.8082	.5311	.3996	.4442

Table 35

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance Results Relative to Positions of Perceived Final Decision Makers for Coordination Decisions at Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges

	POSITION INCUMBENTS																
	DISTRICT/CENTRAL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE									
Statistic	Board of Trustees	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District Wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Department Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other	Don't Know
LARGE SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	4.25	4.62	0.00	.88	.50	0.00	.25	5.11	0.00	3.78	0.00	2.56	1.78	.44	.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
SD	1.67	2.62	0.00	.99	.76	0.00	.46	3.18	0.00	2.64	0.00	2.79	2.54	1.01	.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
MID SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	3.33	5.17	0.00	1.33	.67	0.00	0.00	4.67	.11	3.78	.33	2.67	.89	.56	.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
SD	2.06	2.71	0.00	1.50	.82	0.00	0.00	3.57	.33	3.73	.71	3.16	1.62	.88	.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
SMALL SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	2.56	4.22	0.00	1.78	.44	0.00	.11	6.89	0.00	5.11	0.00	.89	1.22	.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SD	2.07	1.56	0.00	2.05	.53	0.00	.33	2.67	0.00	2.62	0.00	1.69	1.99	.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMPUTED F	1.62	.31	NA	.67	.19	NA	.92	1.24	1.00	.5766	2.00	1.30	.42	.75	2.15	NA	NA	NA
PROBABILITY OF GREATER CRITICAL F	.2227	.7381	NA	.5242	.8267	NA	.4147	.3057	.3827	.5694	.1573	.2917	.6625	.4815	.1379	NA	NA	NA

Table 36

Means, Standard Deviations, and Analysis of Variance Results Relative to Positions of Perceived Participants (Including Final Decision Makers) for Coordination Decisions in Large, Mid-Size, and Small Multi-Campus Community Colleges Positions

	POSITION INCUMBENTS																	
	DISTRICT/CENTRAL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE										
Statistic	Board of Trustees	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District Wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Department Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other	Don't Know
LARGE SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	4.00	5.00	.27	1.76	.89	0.00	.56	7.67	0.00	8.27	.33	5.89	4.78	2.67	.56	.11	0.00	0.00
SD	2.87	2.74	.44	2.49	.93	0.00	1.33	2.78	0.00	3.27	.50	4.99	3.66	2.18	1.13	.33	0.00	0.00
MID SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	7.89	4.89	0.00	2.11	1.00	0.00	0.00	6.33	.11	7.00	.44	6.44	4.00	2.78	1.44	0.00	.44	.11
SD	2.37	2.80	0.00	2.67	1.50	0.00	0.00	4.12	.33	4.66	.73	4.16	3.74	2.54	1.41	0.00	1.33	.33
SMALL SIZE COMMUNITY COLLEGES																		
Mean	3.11	6.56	.11	3.22	.44	0.00	.11	8.78	0.00	9.89	.22	4.22	4.44	2.00	.44	0.00	0.00	0.00
SD	2.26	2.50	.33	2.77	.53	0.00	.33	2.68	0.00	2.71	.67	3.38	4.85	1.73	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMPUTED F	.49	1.22	1.09	.74	.69	NA	1.24	1.27	1.00	1.43	.27	.67	.08	.34	1.87	1.00	1.00	1.00
PROBABILITY OF GREATER CRITICAL F	.6175	.3115	.3520	.4898	.5120	NA	.3066	.3001	.3827	.2598	.7636	.5191	.9249	.7175	.1756	.3827	.3827	.3827

Analysis of variance was chosen for the analysis since it allows a comparison of more than two groups to be made. The .05 significance level was used to avoid a Type I error.

Comparisons for Policy Decisions

Data relative to final decision makers. Based on the means shown in Table 31, the position incumbents most frequently perceived as final decision makers for policy decisions within the large, mid-size, and small colleges were the same. The boards of trustees were the most frequently perceived final decision makers for policy decisions followed by the district chief administrative officers, the campus chief administrative officers, and the academic officers at the campus and district levels. The district student affairs officers were not perceived as final decision makers by any of the respondents in the large and mid-size colleges and the students were not perceived as final decision makers in any of the colleges.

To determine if a significant difference existed by position, among the three groups, a series of analysis of variance tests were computed using the .05 level of significance. Table 31 indicates that no significant differences were found based on this criterion. Thus, the answer to the third problem question relative to the final decision makers for policy decisions is that there is no difference in frequency of position incumbents' involvement as final decision makers for policy decisions at large, mid-size, or small multi-campus community colleges.

Data relative to participants (including final decision makers). As indicated in Table 32, the four most frequently selected position incumbents; boards of trustees, district chief administrative officers, campus chief administrative officers, and campus academic officers; were the same for all size categories. The boards of trustees were the position incumbents most frequently perceived as participants in policy decisions in large colleges, while in mid-size colleges the campus academic officers were the top ranked position incumbent and in small colleges it was the campus chief administrative officers.

To determine if a significant difference existed relative to frequency of participation in policy decision making, by position, among the three groups, a series of one-way analysis of variance tests was done using a .05 level of significance. As can be seen in Table 32, only in the case of the campus chief administrative officers was a significant difference found. Thus, the answer to the third problem question relative to participants (including final decision makers) in policy decision making is that only in the involvement of the campus chief administrative officers was there any significant difference in the frequency of position incumbents' involvement in decision-making processes at large, mid-size, and small multi-campus community colleges.

Comparisons for Allocative Decisions

Data relative to final decision makers. Based on the means reported in Table 33, the position incumbents most frequently perceived as final

decision makers for allocative decisions in all size categories were the campus chief administrative officers, the district chief administrative officers, and the campus academic officers. In small colleges, the business officers and local campus committees were not perceived as final decision makers by any of the respondents.

To determine if a significant difference existed, by position, among the three groups, a series of analysis of variance tests was computed using a .05 level of significance. As can be noted in Table 33, only in the case of the department chairmen was there a significant difference found. Thus, the answer to problem question three relative to the final decision makers for allocative decisions is that only in the involvement of the department chairmen was there any significant difference in the frequency of position incumbents' involvement as final decision makers for allocative decisions based on college size.

Data relative to participants (including final decision makers). Based on the means shown in Table 34 relative to the participants (including final decision makers) in allocative decision-making processes at large, mid-size, and small multi-campus community colleges, the position incumbents most frequently perceived as participants are not the same for all size categories. The campus chief administrative officers are most frequently perceived as participants (including final decision makers) in large and small colleges. In large colleges the campus chief administrative officers are followed by the campus academic officer and the division chairmen. In mid-size colleges

the campus academic officers are most frequently perceived as participants followed by the campus chief administrative officers and the division chairmen. In small colleges the campus chief administrative officers are followed by the campus academic officers and the district chief administrative officers.

A series of analysis of variance tests at the .05 significance level was done to determine if a significant difference existed relative to frequency of participation in allocative decision making, by position, among the three groups. The campus chief administrative officers are the only position incumbents for which a significant difference is found (see Table 34). Thus, the answer to problem question three relative to participants (including final decision makers) is that only in the involvement of campus chief administrative officers was there any significant difference in the frequency of the position incumbents' involvement as participants in the allocative decision-making process based on college size.

Comparisons for Coordination Decisions

Data relative to final decision makers. It can be noted from the means reported in Table 35 that the position incumbent most frequently perceived as final decision maker for coordination decisions in large and small multi-campus community colleges was the campus chief administrative officer; whereas, in mid-size colleges the position incumbent most frequently perceived as final decision maker was the district chief administrative officer. In large colleges the

campus chief administrative officers were followed by the district chief administrative officers and the boards of trustees. In mid-size colleges the district chief administrative officers were followed by the campus chief administrative officers and the campus academic officers. The campus chief administrative officers for small colleges were followed by the campus academic officers and the district chief administrative officers. Three position incumbents--the district business officers, the district student affairs officers, and students--were not perceived as final decision makers by any of the respondents. The campus business officers and the campus student affairs officers were not perceived as final decision makers by any of the respondents from large and small colleges.

The series of analysis of variance tests computed in order to determine if a significant difference existed, by position, between the three groups, found no significant difference at the .05 level. Hence, the answer to question three of the problem statement relative to the final decision makers for coordination decisions is that there was no difference in the frequency of the position incumbents' involvement as final decision makers in the decision-making process for coordination decisions based on college size.

Data relative to participants (including final decision makers). The position incumbents most frequently perceived as participants (including final decision makers) in decision-making processes relative to coordination decisions in large, mid-size, and small multi-campus

community colleges were the campus academic officers. In large and mid-size colleges the campus academic officers were followed by the campus chief administrative officers and the division chairmen, and in small colleges by the campus chief administrative officers and the district chief administrative officers.

To determine if a significant difference existed, by position, among the three groups, a series of analysis of variance tests were computed using a .05 level of significance. No significant differences were found based on this criterion (see Table 36). Thus, the answer to question three of the problem statement relative to participants (including final decision makers) for coordination decisions is that there is no significant difference in frequency of position incumbents' involvement as participants in decision-making processes for coordination decisions based on college size.

Even though not related directly to the questions which gave direction to the study, it was deemed of interest to examine the frequency of "don't know" responses by respondent classification. Table 37 depicts the use of the "don't know" response for the decision point analysis questions relative to the final decision makers for each decision item and to the participants in the decision-making process for each item. The top-level administrators used the response of "don't know" only twice while the mid-level administrators used this response category a total of 105 times. The faculty's use of the response category more than twice as many times as the mid-level administrators would indicate a lesser familiarity with the decision-making process.

The individual decision items receiving the greatest number of "don't know" responses were number 11 with 40 respondents reporting they did not know who made the decision and number 8 with 36 respondents not knowing who made the decision. It should be noted that both these decision items related to student affairs issues.

An Analysis of the Extent of Centralization or Decentralization Relative to the Three Categories of Decision Making

The answer to the fourth question put forth in the statement of the problem relative to the extent multi-campus community college systems are centralized or decentralized in relation to the three categories of decision-making identified was sought through presentation and analysis of data in this section. For purposes of this analysis, centralized is defined as the district-level or central-level of the organizational structure and decentralized as the campus-level or college-level of the organizational structure. Frequency tables which summarize previously presented data are included to assist in the presentation and analysis by inspection and narration.

Table 38 is a summary of the data from the responses to question C of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument relative to the locus of decision making for each type of decision. This table represents the totals of the two categories of district-level responses and the two categories of campus-level responses plus the category of both levels shared equally. Of the three types of decisions considered herein, the policy decisions are more often perceived to be made at the district level. The other two types of decisions, allocative and coordination,

Table 37

Frequency of "Don't Know" Response by Respondent Type

Involvement	Respondent Type Top Admin.	Mid Admin.	Faculty
Final Decision Maker	1	79	181
Participant	1	26	44
TOTALS	2	105	225

Table 38

Respondent Perception of Level of Decision-Making By Decision Type (in percent)

Decision Type	District	Both Equally	Campus
Policy	49.5	17.1	33.3
Allocative	29.5	17.4	43.1
Coordination	30.4	21.0	48.5

are most frequently perceived to be made at the campus level. Although a majority of the responses were at the district level for policy decisions and at the campus level for allocative and coordination decisions, there is not a clear indication of one level over the other for a particular type of decision.

Table 39 was compiled from the totals of the responses to questions A and B of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument for each type of decision. It represents the sum of the total percentages for the position incumbents at the central/district level and the campus/college level for each decision type. From this table it can be observed that the decision makers for policy decisions are almost equally divided between the district/central level and the campus/college level while the decision makers for allocative and coordination decisions and the participants for all types of decisions are more frequently perceived to be at the campus/college level.

Based on these data, a particular type of decision making cannot be designated centralized or decentralized. However, of the three types of decisions--policy, allocative, and coordination--the policy decisions are more centralized relative to the final decision makers and allocative and coordination decisions are most decentralized in regards to the final decision makers. For all types of decisions, the participation by other position incumbents is decentralized.

Summary

This chapter was a presentation and analysis of the data obtained from the decision point analysis instrument in order to answer the

Table 39

Totals of Respondents' Perceptions of Position Incumbents' Involvement by Organizational Level by Decision Type (in percent)

Organizational Level	DECISION TYPES					
	POLICY		ALLOCATIVE		COORDINATION	
	Decision Maker	Participant	Decision Maker	Participant	Decision Maker	Participant
District/Central	48.8	25.9	38.0	20.2	40.8	20.2
Campus/College	49.7	73.7	60.3	70.1	57.4	79.1

four questions set forth in the statement of the problem. Each section of Chapter III addressed one of those question. The first section sought to answer the question regarding the locus of decision making for each of the three types of decisions. The second section was concerned with the study respondents' perceptions of the final decision makers and participants in the decision-making processes for the three types of decisions at multi-campus community colleges divided by size into three categories--large, mid-size, and small. An analysis of the differences in frequency of these responses was the purpose of section three, and the final section was an examination of the extent of centralization and decentralization of the decision-making processes relative to the three types of decisions.

CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first section of the chapter is a summary of the study reported herein and includes the answers to the four questions posed as part of the statement of the problem. The second section is a discussion of the implications that can be drawn from the findings. This is followed by a listing of recommendations regarding further research.

Summary

The growth of the multi-campus community college concept within the United States was so rapid that it allowed for no studied and academic approach to the organization and management of these systems. As the decision-making process is the essence of the organization and governance of an institution, it appeared to be a logical place to initiate a study.

The process of decision-making relative to the three areas of decision-making identified by Talcott Parsons in 1960 was the focus for this study. He explained the decision-making function of an organization in terms of policy, allocative, and coordination type decisions. The specific focus of this study was four questions relevant to these three types of decisions and the processes for making them within multi-campus community colleges. The questions were concerned

with the locus for each type of decision, the position incumbents involved in the decision-making process for each type of decision, the relationship between the position incumbents' involvement and the size of the institution, and whether or not there exists a clear centralization or decentralization of the decision-making process regarding the three types of decisions. A modification of the Decision Point Analysis Instrument (Appendix C) was used in order to obtain the data to answer the questions.

A random sample of approximately half the multi-campus community colleges in the United States was selected from the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory for participation in the study. The 37 colleges designated in this way were requested to forward a catalog(s) to the researcher and the 33 who responded to this request were considered the institutions participating in the study. Additionally, three groups of participants were identified from these institutions. Top administrators were defined as the chief administrative officer of the multi-campus college and the chief administrative officers at each campus. Mid-level administrators were identified as campus-level administrators above the faculty level and below the level of the chief administrative officer. The final group from which a response was solicited was the faculty.

Packets containing a list of faculty and administrators randomly selected from the catalog and decision point analysis instruments and directions for completing them for each individual on the list were mailed to the college president's office. Packets of completed

instruments were returned by 27 multi-campus community colleges. Using total enrollment as the criterion, these 27 colleges were grouped by size with 9 colleges falling into each of three categories.

Using the procedure described, the four problem statement questions and the answers obtained were as follows:

1. What is the locus of decision making in the following areas of multi-campus operation: (a) policy, (b) allocation of resources, and (c) coordination? Policy decisions are more frequently perceived to be made always at the district level (35% of the time). The combination of "always district" and "more often district than campus" responses was 49.5% of the total response with the "always campus" and "more often campus than district" combined response equaling only 33.3% of the response. The remainder was a 17.1% response for "both levels equally."

The locus of decision making for allocative decisions was perceived to be more often at the campus than the district level (28.6% of the time) with the "more often campus than district" and the "always campus level" responses representing 53.1% of the total for allocative decisions. The two categories for district-level loci represented 29.5% of the total and "both levels equally" received 17.4% of the response.

For coordination decisions, 25.2% of the responses were for the "more often campus than district" category. A combined response rate of 48.8% for the two campus-level categories gave that level the majority of response. The district-level combined responses equaled

30.4% of the total and "both levels equally" was perceived as the locus by 21% of the respondents.

2. What position incumbents contributed to the formal processes used in these areas of decision-making? The board of trustees, campus chief administrative officer, the district chief administrative officer, and the campus academic officer represented 57.6% of the response as final decision makers for policy decisions. Specifically, the board of trustees were perceived as involved 17.4% of the time; the campus chief administrative officer, 15.3%; the district chief administrative officer, 13.1%; and the campus academic officer, 11.8%. The remaining 42.4% of the response was distributed throughout the 14 remaining position incumbents with the least response for the district student affairs officer and the student. The "other" category at both the district and campus level and the "don't know" category also received few responses. As participants for policy decisions, the faculty, the campus academic officer, the division chairman, the department chairman, and the campus chief administrative officer were the primary position incumbents indicated with a total of 54.2% of the response. The remaining response was more evenly distributed over six additional positions. A total of 35.9% of the response indicated involvement by the district chief administrative officer, the district business officer, the district academic officer, a district-wide committee, the campus student affairs officer, and a local campus committee.

The position incumbents involved as final decision makers in allocative decisions were the campus chief administrative officer (18.6% of the time), the district chief administrative officer (19.9%), the campus academic officer (12.1%), and the board of trustees (8.3%) for a total of 51.9% of the total response. The categories receiving the least response were the district-wide committee, the district student affairs officer, the local campus committee, and the student; all with less than 2% response rate. The "other" categories and "don't know" category also received less than 2% response. The faculty, the department chairman, the division chairman, and the campus academic officer were involved as participants in allocative decisions about 54.4% of the time. Specifically, the faculty received 15.4% of the response; the department chairman, 14.1%; the division chairman, 12.9%; and the campus academic officer, 12%. Those categories with a 1% or less response were the district student affairs officer, the "other" categories at both the district and campus levels, and the "don't know" category. The board of trustees were perceived as participants in allocative decisions only 1.5% of the time.

In the area of coordination decisions, the campus chief administrative officer, the district chief administrative officer, the campus academic officer, and the board of trustees were involved as final decision makers 61% of the time. Most frequently perceived as a final decision maker was the campus chief administrative officer, 18.9% of the time; followed by the district chief administrative officer, 15.8%; the campus academic officer, 13.9%; and the board of trustees, 12.4%.

The position incumbents and categories receiving a minimal response of less than 2% were the campus student affairs officer, 1.3%; the district business officer, .6%; the district student affairs officer, .2%; the student, .2%; and the "other" categories, .9% district level and .7% campus level. As participants in coordination decisions, the department chairman, the campus academic officer, the division chairman, and the faculty were involved a total of 60.8% of the time. The department chairman received the greater number of responses with 17%, the campus academic officer was next at 15.6%, then the division chairman at 15%, and finally the faculty with 13.2% response. A minimal response of 2% or less was received by the campus student affairs officer (1.6%), the district business officer (1.4%), the student (1.3%), the campus business officer (.9%), the district student affairs officer (.5%), and the two "other" categories (.9% district and .7% campus). The "don't know" response was at .9% also.

3. Is there a relationship between the size of the institution and the position incumbents involved in specific areas of decision making? Relative to final decision makers for policy decisions, no significant difference was found at the .05 level of significance, by position, in position incumbents' involvement in the three sizes of colleges. As participants in policy decisions, a significant difference was found at the .05 level of significance for the involvement of the campus chief administrative officer. The mean frequency of involvement for the campus chief administrative officer in small colleges was 9.00 while in large colleges the mean frequency

was 5.44 and in mid-size colleges it was 5.33. This indicates a difference in level of involvement based on the size of the college for the campus chief administrative officers as participants in policy decision making.

The position incumbents involved as final decision makers for allocative decisions when compared by school size resulted in a significant difference at the .05 level for only the department chairman position. The mean frequency of involvement as final decision maker for the department chairmen in small colleges was 1.22. In large colleges the mean frequency of involvement was .56 and in mid-size colleges it was .11. This indicates a difference in the level of involvement based on the size of the college for department chairmen as participants in allocative decision making. The comparisons by school size of the frequency of involvement as participants in allocative decisions resulted in a significant difference at the .05 level for the campus chief administrative officer. The mean frequency of involvement for the campus chief administrative officer as a participant in large colleges was 9.25, in small colleges was 8.11, and in mid-size colleges was 5.10. This significant difference at the .05 level indicates a difference in level of involvement in allocative decisions by campus chief administrative officers based on the size of the college.

As final decision makers and participants in decision-making processes for coordination decisions, no significant differences were found at the .05 level of significance, by position, in position incumbents' involvement based on college size.

4. To what extent are the multi-campus community college systems centralized or decentralized in relation to the three types of decision making identified herein? The perceived locus of decision making for policy decisions was more central than campus--49.5% frequency of response to 33.3%-- or more centralized than decentralized. The locus of decision making for allocative and coordination decisions was perceived to be more at the campus level than at the district level--more decentralized than centralized.

The total of responses to particular position incumbents' involvement as final decision makers in policy decision making were very evenly distributed with 48.8% representing the district-level and 49.7% at the campus-level. Participants in policy decision making were position incumbents at the district-level 25.9% of the time and at the campus-level 73.7% of the time.

For allocative decisions, the particular position incumbents involved as final decision makers were at the district-level 38% of the time and at the campus-level 60.3% of the time. Participants in allocative decisions were position incumbents at the district-level 20.2% of the time and at the campus-level 79.1% of the time.

The position incumbents involved as final decision makers for coordination decisions were at the district-level 40.8% of the time and at the campus-level 57.4% of the time. As participants in these decisions, the involved position incumbents were at the district-level 20.2% of the time and 79.1% of the time they were at the campus-level.

Implications

Based on an examination of the data reported herein a number of implications can be drawn. Following herewith is a discussion of the implications derived from the data analysis.

1. In the case of all three types of decisions the campus chief administrative officer was perceived as a final decision maker by a greater percentage of the respondents than the district chief administrative officer and, for policy decisions, the campus chief administrative officer was perceived as a participant in the decision-making process. This result of the data analysis implies that the campus chief administrative officer is more influential in the decision-making processes than the district chief administrative officer. Under these circumstances, it would seem that a way for an individual to influence decisions is through the campus chief administrative officer. The reporting of the campus chief administrative officer as more frequently involved in all types of decision-making processes further implies that the campus chief administrative officer is more concerned with the operation of the institution and that the district chief administrative officer is more concerned with external affairs such as public relations and legislative matters. The district office position incumbents' lack of involvement in the decision-making process may influence the degree to which the campus chief administrative officer is involved.

2. The data for the survey item regarding the locus of decision making indicated policy decisions are more frequently made at the

district level (see Table 1) while the respondents' perception of the position incumbents involved in policy decisions is the campus/college level position incumbents 49.7% of the time and the district/central level position incumbents 49.9% of the time. This implies an ambivalence or even confusion on the part of the respondents in their perceptions of the locus and the position incumbents involved for policy-type decisions.

3. The allocative and coordination decision-making processes are more decentralized according to the analysis of the locus of decision-making data and the perceptions of the position incumbents involved data. The implication is that those decisions affecting the day-to-day operation of the institution are made at the lower level of the organization, the level where they are implemented.

4. The board of trustees was more frequently perceived as the final decision maker for policy decisions than was any other position incumbent. They were minimally perceived as participants in any of the types of decision making, thus indicating that they are perceived as actively involved in making decisions but not involved in the role of providing information, selecting alternatives, or evaluating those alternatives. These results reinforce the literature (Blocker et al., 1965; Millett ,1968, 1980) which described the role of the boards of trustees as one of policy makers with the staff implementing the policy. Not clear, however, is the source of the policy itself.

5. The participants for all types of decisions were campus-level position incumbents, the faculty, department chairman, the division

chairman, and the campus academic officer. The literature which noted that decision making should involve the lowest level within the organization to be affected by the decision (Blocker et al., 1965; Millett, 1962; Simon, 1960) is emphasized by these results. However, the faculty is most frequently designated as a participant by the respondents, yet, the faculty who responded to the survey indicated they do not perceive themselves as active in the decision-making process (see Tables 12, 21, and 30). This implies that the top-level and mid-level administrators perceived the faculty as involved in the decision-making process to a greater extent than faculty perceived themselves to be involved.

6. The campus academic officer was reported as a primary decision maker and as a primary participant which implies that this position incumbent is perceived as having a significant influence in the decision-making processes of an institution. It also implies that, as with the campus chief administrative officer, an important way to achieve influence is through this individual.

7. The data analysis also implied that decisions perceived to require uniformity throughout the entire multi-campus system were made at the district level. Namely, all of the policy decisions (except number 9 which can be interpreted as meeting a local campus need) have the board of trustees as a primary decision maker (see Table 4) and the locus of decision making was perceived to be at the district level (see Table 1). Also, a decision (item 13) relative to awarding tenure to a faculty member is perceived as a decision made by the board of

trustees. This too implies a decision which needs uniformity throughout the system and that the necessary uniformity is achieved through the board of trustees making the final decision.

The implications of the study reported herein are summed up in the following manner. The findings reinforce the literature in that the board of trustees was reported as the primary decision maker for policy decisions but the participants in those decision-making processes were from the lower eschelon of position incumbents. The findings also indicate that the campus chief administrative officer and the campus academic officer are the position incumbents most involved in the decision-making processes as final decision makers and as participants which implies that an important way to achieve influence over the decision-making process is through these two position incumbents. A further implication of the findings is that the campus chief administrative officer is more concerned with the operation of the institution, whereas the district chief administrative officer is more concerned with the factors external to the institution which affect its functions and operation. The findings also imply that the administrators perceive faculty to be involved as active participants in the decision-making processes while the faculty perceive themselves to be only minimally involved. As a result of these findings and implications derived from them, recommendations for further study are made in the following section.

Recommendations

Survey research conducted by mail has as a major weakness the inability of the researcher to clarify and expand questions for the respondents. Consequently, there is the danger of misinterpretation of survey items. It is therefore recommended that future studies of this nature be designed to check the accuracy of aggregated data through on-site research visits to individual institutions.

Since only perceptual information was obtained in this study, there is no evidence of the relationship between the perceptions of the decision-making process and the actual decision-making processes in these colleges. Therefore, a second recommendation for further study is that actual decision-making processes in some of these colleges be investigated in order to provide a comparison of perceptions with reality.

The investigation of the types of decisions and the degree of consistency among perceptions of position incumbents involved in all types of decisions raises a question of the extent to which the operational decisions made in an institution affect changes in policy. It is recommended that future research be designed to investigate the development of policy within multi-campus colleges and thereby determine the extent to which operational decisions influence the policy decisions and also to provide an analysis of the position incumbents participating in those decision processes.

The "other" responses were recorded and were noted by the researcher for inclusion when a significant number appeared for a single decision item. Although not recorded frequently enough for any one decision item to be included in the data analysis, the "other"

response of collective bargaining agreement, contract, union, and bargaining unit was often listed as a final decision maker. Therefore, it is suggested that future study investigate whether there is a discernible connection between collective bargaining contracts and the position incumbents participating in the three types of decisions.

Since the data analysis implies the campus chief administrative officer is more involved in the operation of the institution while the district chief administrative officer is more involved in external activities related to the college, there is no clear understanding of the role of these position incumbents within the organization of the multi-campus community college. The final recommendation for research suggested here would be a study designed to investigate the role and responsibilities of these two positions in the organization of the multi-campus institution.

REFERENCES

Baxter, C., Jr., & Corcoran, J. (1972). Medusan monster or ingenuous model? Community and Junior College Journal, 15(6), 18-20.

Bielen, A. V. (1974). Guidelines for budget administration in selected multi-campus community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 621-A.

Block, M. H. (1970). MUD*--An increasing dilemma for community junior colleges. Junior College Journal, 40(6), 23-25.

Blocker, C. E., Plummer, R. H., & Richardson, R. C., Jr. (1965). The two-year college: A social synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Buckner, R. G., Jr. (1975). An investigation of the roles of community college chief executive officers: A comparison of selected multi-campus and multi-instiution public community college districts (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 7826-A.

Carhart, J. I., & Collins, C. C. (1977). Governance: A community college model. Pittsburgh, CA: Community College Press.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). Governance of higher education--Six priority problems. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chang, N. K. (1978). Organizational structure in multi-campus community junior colleges/districts (Report No. JC 780 452). Denver, CO: Denver Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 795)

Community, junior, and technical college directory. (1983). Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Conway, J. A. (1984). The myth, mystery, and mastery of participative decision making in education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 11-35.

Dale, E. (1952). Planning and developing the company organization structure. New York: American Management Association.

Eye, G. C., Gregg, R. T., Lipham, J. M., Netzer, L. A., & Francke, D. C. (1966). Relationship between institutional change and the extent to which school administrators and teachers agree on the location of responsibilities for administrative decisions (OE Cooperative Research Project No. 5-0443). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Griffiths, D. E. (1959). Administrative theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Henry, T. C., & Creswell, J. W. (1983). The levels of decision making in multi-unit community college systems. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 7, 115-130.

Holcombe, W. N. (1974). The locus of formal decision-making for curriculum and instruction in selected multi-campus community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 637-A.

Jenkins, J. A., & Rossmeier, J. G. (1974). Relationships between centralization/decentralization and organizational effectiveness in urban multi-unit community college systems: A summary report (Report No. JC 750409). Ann Arbor: Michigan University, Center for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 11 0103)

Jensen, A. M. (1965). Urban community colleges go multicampus. Junior College Journal, 36(6), 8-13.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. (1983). Educational administration--An introduction (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Kintzer, F. C. (1972). Decision making in the multi-unit college. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Kintzer, F. C. (1984). Decision making in multi-unit institutions of higher education. Gainesville: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education.

Kintzer, F. C., Jensen, A. M., & Hansen, J. S. (1969). The multi-institution junior college district. Monograph series of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Masiko, P., Jr. (1966). Going multicampus. Junior College Journal, 27(2), 22-26.

McCluskey, J. W. (1972). An investigation of the locus of formal decision-making for student personnel services in selected multi-unit community college districts (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 96-A.

Millett, J. D. (1962). The academic community. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Millett, J. D. (1968). Decision making and administration in higher education. Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press.

Millett, J. D. (1980). Management, governance, and leadership. New York: Amacom.

Parsons, T. (1960). Structure and process in modern societies. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Pfleger, J. W. (1982). The locus of formal decision making in selected school systems relative to the operation of an instructional program provided by an outside agency (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 349-A.

Ramstad, W. K. (1969). Multicampus: Ready--set--go! Junior College Journal, 39(6), 25-30.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. (1973). Governing the multiunit community college system. Educational Record, 17, 141-146.

Richardson, R. C., Blocker, C. E., & Bender, L. W. (1972). Governance for the two-year college. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Rossmeier, J. G. (1976). Perspectives on multiunit colleges. New Directions for Community Colleges, 4(1), 77-88.

Rouse, W. L. (1983). The locus of formal decision making in Christian College Coalition institutions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1602-A.

Rushing, J. B. (1970). Managing the multi-campus. College Management, 5(9), 14-16.

Rushing, J. B. (1980). Managing the multi-campus--Twelve years later. Community and Junior College Journal, 21(9), 16-20.

Sammartino, P. (1964). Multiple campuses. New York: Van Rees Press.

Scaggs, S. W. (1980). Decision-making processes involved in curriculum change as perceived by faculty and administrators in Florida community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1883-A.

Simon, H. A. (1957). Administrative behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Simon, H. A. (1960). The new science of management decision. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Simon, H. A. (1977). The new science of management decision (rev. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Thompson, J. D., & Tuden, A. (1963). Strategies, structures, and processes of organizational decision. In J. D. Thompson, P. B. Hammond, R. W. Hawkes, B. H. Junker, & A. Tuten (Eds.), Comparative studies in administration (pp. 195-216). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wattenbarger, J. L. (1977). Decision making in multi-unit districts. Community College Review, 5(2), 8-14.

Wygal, B. R., & Owen, H. J., Jr. (1975). Governing a multicampus district. New Directions for Community Colleges, 3(2), 27-36.

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

March 16, 1984

Dear

The Institute of Higher Education is sponsoring a study of decision-making structures in multi-campus community colleges. The major researcher for the study is Donna Miller. The initial phase of the study resulted in the collection of catalogs from various institutions throughout the United States. As a result of information gathered, the second phase of the study, a survey of selected institutions, is being initiated.

The second part involves response to a decision point analysis instrument by administrators and faculty within the institutions. We need your assistance and cooperation in this process.

Enclosed are a list of individuals determined by random sample of the faculty and staff listed in your catalog and survey instruments. We will greatly appreciate it if your office would distribute these instruments to the various colleges within your district and when completed return them to us in the envelope provided. Your assistance will expedite the data collection process and will allow us to gain more complete data from the district.

Please return the completed surveys to us by April 16, 1984. We thank you for your help in meeting this schedule as it is important to the results of the study that your college be included. We will be glad to provide you with a summary of the results if you will return the lower portion of the letter attached to the survey instrument.

We look forward to your early response.

Cordially yours,

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO STUDY PARTICIPANT

March 12, 1984

Dear Study Participant:

You have been selected from the faculty and staff of your institution to participate in a research study sponsored by the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida. The purpose of the study is to investigate the structure for decision-making at multi-campus community colleges in the United States and to identify the participants in the decision-making process.

The attached survey instrument will take approximately 20 minutes of your time. Please complete it and return it to the office which directed it to you; they will see that it is returned to the Institute.

Should you wish to receive the results of the study, you may complete the bottom of this letter and return it with the survey instrument. Your response to the survey instrument will remain completely anonymous. The numbers at the top of the instrument identify the institution and will be used for follow-up purposes. You as an individual are in no way identified.

Thank you for your time and attention to the survey instrument. Your participation in this research study will add to the research knowledge related to this problem and is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donna E. Miller
Research Assistant

Name _____

Address _____

APPENDIX C
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SURVEY BACKGROUND DATA AND INSTRUCTIONS

Please print or type.

1. Title of your current position _____
2. Location of your work (check one):
   a. Campus/College _____
   b. District/Central Office _____

Directions for completing the attached instrument.

The instrument has 18 decision items representing decisions commonly made at community colleges. You will respond to the same four questions for each item following the same instructions and the same format. The only thing that changes is the item which you are responding to. Please indicate your perception as based on your experience in responding to each question as it relates to your present position. Below are the four questions and explanations of each.

A. Who makes the decision? This should be the individual or group of individuals assuming responsibility for making the final choice—the decision maker. Mark the appropriate box(es) with an X. If "other" is your answer, please specify the position title.

B. What other persons participate in making the decision including, but not limited to, those persons providing information to the decision-maker, those who assist in identifying alternative solutions, and those who help evaluate alternatives. Place an O in the box(es) identifying these individuals or groups.

C. Where in your college is this decision made? Indicate the level of the organization, district/central office or campus/college, at which this type of decision is most frequently made. Mark the appropriate box.

D. What is the nature of your participation in making this decision? Select from the six choices the one which best describes how you are involved in this particular decision item.

PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS! THANK YOU!

1. The final decision establishing requirements for a degree.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

2. A decision to spend funds budgeted for audio-visual equipment.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

3. A decision of specific teaching assignment for an individual faculty member (faculty load).

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide Information	None

4. A decision to dismiss a non-tenured faculty member.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide Information	None

5. The decision to award an individual faculty member leave for educational or skill upgrading purposes.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

6. A decision to allocate resources (funds, faculty release time, etc.) for pilot operation of a program or for planning a new program.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

7. The decision establishing the calendar for an academic year.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

8. A decision regarding how to spend budgeted student activity funds.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decisiun	I help make decision	I provide information	None

9. A decision to meet staffing needs by hiring parttime faculty.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

10. A decision to relocate or reassign faculty within the college district.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

11. A decision to provide or contract ancillary services (ie. bookstore or cafeteria).

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

12. The final decision establishing standards for admission.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

13. A decision to award tenure or a continuing contract to a faculty member.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Doo't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

14. A decision to implement board policy in evaluating instruction in a specific course or program.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	Mure Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

15. The final decision to create a new program of study.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

16. A decision regarding the number of new faculty positions to be allocated to an instructional unit.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made?
(Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision?
(Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

17. A decision relative to the instructional budget request within a department/division.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

18. A decision to involve faculty in the decision-making process.

A. Who makes the decision? (Mark with an X below. You may use as many X's as needed.)

DISTRICT/CENTRAL OFFICE LEVEL							CAMPUS/COLLEGE LEVEL										
Board of Trustees	Chief Exec. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	District wide Committee	Student Affairs Officer	Other Specify	Chief Admin. Officer	Business Officer	Academic Officer	Student Affairs Officer	Division Chairman	Dept. Chairman	Faculty	Local Campus Committee	Student	Other Specify	Don't Know

B. Who else participates in making the decision? (Using the above grid, mark with an O all other positions or groups who participate in this decision.)

C. Where in your college is this type of decision made? (Mark with an X the appropriate square.)

1	2	3	4	5
Always District Level	More Often District Than Campus	Both Levels Equally	More Often Campus Than District	Always Campus Level

D. What is the nature of your participation in the making of this decision? (Mark with an X the appropriate box below.)

1	2	3	4	5	6
I make the decision	I approve decision	I recommend decision	I help make decision	I provide information	None

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

April 26, 1984

Dear

The Institute of Higher Education (University of Florida) sent you a packet of instruments last month requesting your assistance in a research study on decision-making in multi-campus community colleges that we are conducting. Since we know for many colleges it is a busy time of year and since we need your reply, we are extending the deadline to May 28, 1984. As it is most important to us for your institution to be represented in the study; we hope this extension will give you adequate time to respond.

Thank you for your attention. We sincerely hope you can assist and support these efforts by returning the completed survey instruments. If I can answer questions or be of other assistance, please call me at 904-392-0695.

Cordinally yours,

Donna E. Miller
Research Associate
Institute of Higher Education

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Donna Elizabeth Miller was born July 24, 1946, in Birmingham, Alabama, the elder of two children of Louise Carter and James Thomas Miller, Jr. In 1949 the family relocated to Valdosta, Georgia, where Donna attended public schools graduating as an honor graduate from Valdosta High School in 1964. She then attended Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (ABAC) in Tifton, Georgia, for five quarters before transferring to the University of Georgia where she completed her Bachelor of Science degree in home economics in 1968. Her master's degree in vocational education was conferred by the University of Georgia in 1971, and she attended Georgia State University for post-graduate study in the mid 1970s. Donna entered the University of Florida for a doctorate in higher education administration in 1978.

She taught mathematics and science at an elementary school in Birmingham, Alabama, vocational home economics at junior and senior high schools in Moultrie, Georgia, and consumer education at a postsecondary institution in Atlanta, Georgia. Her teaching career spanned 11 years followed by 1½ years as a vocational education coordinator for a cooperative educational service agency in southwest

Georgia, a position which she left in order to pursue doctoral studies. While at the University of Florida, she held various graduate and research assistantships. She is currently employed by the Georgia Department of Education as Director of Planning and Operations for the Office of Vocational Education.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James L. Wattenbarger, Chairman
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jimmy G. Cheek
Professor of Agricultural and
Extension Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James W. Hensel
Professor of Educational Leadership

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August, 1986

Dean College of Education

Dean, Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08285 3747